

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 838

HE 001 126

The College Campus in 1969: The Faculty.
Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
Pub Date 69

Note-51p.; Proceedings of the 18th SREB Legislative Work Conference, Hot Springs, Arkansas, July 9-11, 1969

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.65

Descriptors-*Academic Freedom, College Faculty, College Teachers, *Faculty, *Higher Education, *Professors, *Tenure

About 100 legislators from 15 Southern states met July 9-11, 1969 to consider the role of the college faculty member, his rights and responsibilities. In a series of papers presented at the conference, university administrators and faculty discussed the tenure system, academic freedom, faculty militancy, faculty role in governance, and typical duties and functions of professors in a complex university setting, an undergraduate college, and a community college. Recognizing the crisis in public confidence created by campus unrest, these papers intended to give public officials a clear picture of the relationships among members of the academic community. In a similar work conference held in 1968, the focus of consideration was the student. (JS)

ED0 32838



The Faculty.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 126

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	iii
Opening Address	
Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr.	1
The Academic Community: Its Members and Their Relationships	
Emmett B. Fields	4
The Faculty: Who They Are, What They Do	
Wilbert McKeachie	9
How Faculty Members Do Their Jobs: In a Complex University	
Herman E. Spivey	13
How Faculty Members Do Their Jobs: In an Undergraduate College	
W. Hugh McEniry	16
How Faculty Members Do Their Jobs: In a Community College	
Arthur Southerland	18
What Is the Faculty's Role in Institutional Decision-Making?	
Henry L. Mason	20
Governmental Structure and Decision Making in the University: An Administrative View	
Archie R. Dykes	25
Governmental Structure and Decision Making in the University: A Faculty View	
Robert R. Wright	28
The Tenure System as Viewed by a Faculty Member	
C. Addison Hickman	30
The Tenure System as Viewed by an Administrator	
David Mathews	34
The Tenure System as Viewed by a Legislator	
Robert Graham	36
Influences of the New Faculty	
Lewis B. Mayhew	38
Emerging and Prospective New Relationships in the Academic Community	
William B. Aycock	42
Roster of Delegates and Participants	47

FOREWORD

Continuing a dialogue begun a year ago in Austin, the 1969 Legislative Work Conference of the Southern Regional Education Board focused on the college campus—the members of the academic community and their relationships. Last year, the emphasis was on the student. This year, the focus was on the faculty.

About 100 legislators from 15 Southern states met in Hot Springs, Arkansas, July 17-18 for an intensive examination of the college faculty member, his rights and his responsibilities. A group of experienced on-campus observers brought new perspectives to such issues as the tenure system, academic freedom, faculty militancy and the oft-predicted student-faculty confrontation. These topics stimulated spirited discussions by the legislative delegates.

General themes which ran through the conference were that constructive changes to improve American colleges should be welcomed; that violent disruption must be dealt with firmly no matter how just the complaint at issue; and that response to provocation should be an even-handed enforcement of the laws. Above all, public officials recognize the need to be better informed about the internal roles and relationships of students, faculties, administrators and trustees in these turbulent times for higher education.

Conversely, the leadership in the academic community recognizes the grave crisis of public confidence created by campus disorders, and is aware of the need to convey to the public and to public officials a candid, accurate picture of higher education.

This latter objective is one of the goals of the Legislative Work Conference, and this volume of Proceedings is published in the hope that its contents will help to extend and deepen the dialogue so necessary for calm appraisal and understanding of the college campus in 1969.

Winfred L. Godwin, Director
Southern Regional Education Board

OPENING ADDRESS

**Governor Millis E. Godwin, Jr., Virginia
Chairman, Southern Regional Education Board, 1968-69**

For more than twenty years, the Southern Regional Education Board has provided leadership and support for the South in its continuing quest for excellence in higher education.

As the first interstate agency of its kind, the Board recognized from its inception that the improvement and expansion of the region's universities and colleges were not luxuries but necessities. And in our efforts to achieve excellence, we in the South have marshaled human and financial resources which are most impressive, both in our separate states and collectively through SREB.

While the progress has been striking, we remain far from our goals.

A maximum effort is still needed, but it is possible that the public may not continue indefinitely its truly remarkable response to the needs of higher education. The consensus which year after year has provided higher education with solid public support—and constantly increasing tax funds—is threatened by the violent and disruptive events on many campuses across the nation in recent months.

With the exception of the war in Viet Nam, no public issue has so aroused the American public's concern as has this tide of campus unrest.

We are concerned, all of us, with the strategy and tactics employed by radical student groups across the nation as they attempt to convert the healthy desire for change and improvement into a general rebellion against "the system."

Unfortunately, not all of us have been equally concerned with determining what really is wrong with "the system" and trying to improve it, thus raising the quality of American life and simultaneously robbing the radicals of the issues they use to stir more general discontent on the campuses.

Stopping campus disturbances has become a top national priority in recent months, and of course it is essential that violence and disruption cease.

I believe, however, that the preservation of our free society depends equally on the manner in which we deal with this problem, and that the Southern Regional Education Board made a crucial point in a statement adopted at its annual meeting in Miami Beach last month.

Let me read a part of that statement to you, and I quote:

We are agreed that violence has no place in the scholarly community and that — — reason is the ultimate objective of all education. The Board expresses its confidence in the ability of the university administrators to use the laws now at their command to maintain reason and calm without denying the American tradition of dissent and debate.

We need to understand, as I told our Board members, that the vast majority of American students is not predisposed to using force, coercion and revolutionary tactics to produce change on campus, and this is true even at those universities and colleges which have suffered the most crippling and harmful confrontations.

It is commonly estimated that radicals, those who seek to overthrow established authority, represent only about two percent of the nation's seven million college students. Many more students are sympathetic, because they, too, favor change in the system, but they do not support the methods employed by the radicals.

The message which must be carried to the general public is that constructive efforts to change American colleges should be welcomed, that destructive efforts should be dealt with firmly, that response to provocation should be limited to a just enforcement of the laws, and that government action should be wholly supportive of university leaders as they seek to maintain order, protect life and property, and preserve their institutions.

In brief, the whole of higher education must not be penalized because of the disruptive rabble-rousing of the radical minority which claims it would improve the university by subverting the freedom to teach and learn and by destroying the rule of reason.

This point of view, I believe, is sound. But I do not intend that it should be interpreted as a "hear no evil" approach.

Campus chaos has made the entire question of university governance and operation a matter of great public moment, and those public officials directly involved in the planning, financing and control of higher education need to take a more active interest in campus matters.

They need to be better informed regarding the internal roles and relationships of students, faculties, administrators and trustees.

It is this need to be informed which I think makes this gathering in Hot Springs particularly worthwhile.

Just as your Legislative Work Conference a year ago cast a revealing light on the issues and emotions which stir today's students, this conference should help all of us, you and me, understand what has happened in the changing world of the teacher and scholar during the turbulent years since the end of World War II.

Like the students, faculty members have played and are playing various roles on the current campus scene. We know that not all faculty members are militant, not all are apathetic, and not all are sympathetic to the actions that disrupt orderly processes at our institutions.

But how much do we, as laymen, really know about the pressures which bear upon the teacher and the researcher?

We hear that faculty loyalties have changed, largely because of the increased competition for their services.

We know that their salaries have been rising steadily in recent years.

We hear that some universities operate on the publish-or-perish principle.

We know that professors at many colleges have tenure.

We know that professors give fierce protection to something called academic freedom which is variously defined.

For the most part, I suspect that we know these things only as they are stated here, and that we have too little knowledge of their full meaning in terms of daily operations on campus.

If we are to evaluate our institutions and attempt to influence wisely the reshaping of them, we clearly need fuller knowledge and deeper understanding of them. Certainly responsible public officials desire both more facts and more insight in helping to strengthen higher education.

I salute SREB's Legislative Advisory Council for recognizing this need and arranging what promises to be a stimulating and enlightening conference for all of us.

Free for a brief period from the usual pressures back home and associating with some of your counterparts from across the region and with these able speakers, I am sure that this can be a valuable learning experience.

One major university president, a member of SREB, told us at the recent annual meeting of the Board that last year's Legislative Work Conference has stimulated several of his state's legislators to return and suggest to him some further meetings within the state to discuss problems of contemporary students.

This annual conference is one way in which SREB carries out one of the major missions for which it was designed—to serve as a fountain of information about higher education so that Southerners, especially those in leadership positions, will have the data and the understanding necessary

to decide wisely whatever must be decided about their colleges and universities.

Certainly, legislators and governors are among those with the greatest "need to know."

The Board conducts many other activities which are aimed at collecting and disseminating information, and this function has been of great service to higher education and to the region over the past two decades.

Current problems in higher education indicate, however, that this effort must not only be continued, but intensified.

In the statement from which I quoted a passage earlier, the Board set forth clearly the challenge which campus unrest presents to SREB. I want to close by reading the final two paragraphs of that statement:

The Southern Regional Education Board, since its creation, has made a strong and continuing effort to increase public understanding and support of higher education. As a unique alliance of educational, political and civic leaders, it is a well-established instrument for promoting the "understanding and calm appraisal" called for by the National Commission on Violence. In no small measure the Board's efforts have nurtured the unprecedented expansion and improvement of higher education in the region over the past 20 years.

In view of the current crisis, SREB must reaffirm its commitment to convey to the public an accurate and complete picture of higher education. It also must assist colleges and universities in responding to the legitimate demands of society and of their students. And, through its leadership it should help chart new directions for the future of higher education.

THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY: ITS MEMBERS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS

Ermett B. Fields, Vice President, Dean of Faculties
University of Houston

The Southern Regional Education Board has a sure instinct for the crucial concerns. Last year, amidst widespread public alarm over the frightening ways of radical youth, the Board spent its annual Legislative Work Conference discussing the place of students on the nation's campuses. This year, as concern deepens and a degree of antagonism flares out toward professors, the conference is devoted to the role of faculties. The timing is impressive. With campus unrest unending, it would be helpful if Winfred Godwin and his advisers would only divulge their plans for the 1970 conference: we could then know in advance what is in store for higher education next year!

It appears to me that higher education continues in the grip of a crisis more serious than any we have known before. So many have been the reports of trouble from the campuses this year that the wire services have resorted to lumping them together in omnibus stories, casualty lists for the week, where one looks anxiously for the name of his favorite college. Berkeley, Columbia, Cornell and the other sensationally troubled places have come to be merely the symbols of a national malady. College and university authorities have responded to their provocations in various ways, some with good effect and some not. And, now, external authorities are considering responses of their own. I need not tell you of the numerous campus bills that have been put into the hoppers of state legislatures; over 100 have been presented in California alone. So with the Congress, also, and even the President of the United States feels compelled to make policy statements about the situation.

The crisis is defined in numerous ways. It is, or is said to be, a crisis of numbers which reduces students to digits in a computer; a crisis of irrelevance which reveals the colleges incapable of change; a crisis of misplaced priorities which sends faculty chasing after research to the neglect of teaching; a crisis of generations in which the young and the old do not understand each other; a crisis of national values in which revolutionaries seek destruction of the system. The interpretations are so many as to make it difficult to discover the fundamental issue. The better part of wisdom, probably, is to recognize that there is a kernel of truth in each of them.

I am more concerned at the moment by the evidences that we are falling into a crisis of confidence. The air is thick with harsh pictures of the groups that participate in or condition higher education: students are nihilists bent on chaos; faculties are promoters of or permissive witnesses to disruption; presidents are ineffectual men without the resources to maintain order; trustees are archetypes of the establishment with scant knowledge of their institutions; legislators and other public officials are the agents of repression. You will recognize these as crude stereotypes, born of what Franklin Ford calls "a rage to simplify." I would have to say that the stereotypes accord very poorly with my own experience: the great majority of people I know in these groups are moderate, capable, responsible, and upright folk. It is hard to avoid the sense, however, that we live in a time of splintering community.

The very words are a warning signal, since distrust is well known to have a way of escalating problems. In the present situation, it could conceivably lead higher education into a crisis of governance. I agree with Theodore Hesburgh, of Notre Dame, that if the colleges cannot manage themselves, there are others who will be willing to step in. I agree just as firmly with Chancellor Samuel Gould, of the State University of New York, that this would be a national calamity. "This tradition of internal governance," as he puts it, "must . . . be preserved. Any attempt, however well-intentioned, to ignore trustee authority or to undermine the university's own patterns of operation, will vitiate the spirit of the institution and kill the very thing it seeks to preserve." Chancellor Gould's remark does not apply to all external efforts to calm the campuses, to be sure, and the crisis of governance is as yet more an incipient threat than a substantial fact. But prudent men must read the signs with care.

I open with these allusions to the broader American community in order to be realistic in speaking about the academic community. As one looks at the various groups that oversee, govern, conduct, and enjoy higher education, interdependence is the key word for their wholesome understanding. This is as true of the groups within the academy as it is of their combined relations with

the wider society, which ultimately shapes what they can and cannot accomplish.

By custom and law, lay boards of trustees hold the ultimate authority that is lodged in institutions of higher learning. The trustees set the broad policies of their institutions, seek funds for them, provide them with financial oversight, interpret them to the public, and generally act as their agents. Legally, the trustees are the institution. From the beginning, lay trustees have been both of and apart from the academy, with responsibilities reaching both inward and outward. They are generally important and busy men, with no time for, and no direct business in, the daily operations of the institutions except as these operations may on occasion show a need for adjustments at the policy level. Of all groups in the academic community, trustees tend to be least visible to faculty and students. This apparent remoteness has sometimes given rise to the claim that the idea of lay trusteeship is outmoded. If a satisfactory substitute is evident, however, I am unaware of it. The influence of trustees on the integrity of colleges and universities may be very subtle, but it is also very real. I would agree with Charles Frankel, that "it is doubtful that faculties and student bodies could by themselves . . . and without the help of trustees, successfully defend their autonomy, even assuming that their economic problems could be solved." The criticism is made that trustees are too often men of advanced age who are insulated from fresh ideas. It does appear that the boards would increase their effectiveness if more young members were included, and if other means were found to quicken their sense of relationship to students and faculty, and to the contemporary situation. The lay board remains a vital part of the system, however, made all the more impressive by the fact that trustees—25,000 of them in the country—offer their talents gratis.

The most crucial act trustees ever perform is the naming of a new president, a fact of which faculties are keenly aware. The role of the president is to guide the board, direct the administration, lead the faculty, mold the student body, provide for the non-academic staff, raise money, provide fiscal and property management, solve problems others cannot handle, speak for the institution, be an educational statesman, symbolize the academic community, and fill all voids. He may appoint vice-presidents and deans to help him with these awesome tasks, they being the subordinate officers to whom authority is delegated, who act as bridges of communication with the various presidential constituencies, and who together perform the necessary work of administering the institution. Administration is essentially a service role which fulfills itself in the well-being of these constituencies, most importantly in the intellectual well-being of faculty and students. It is an extremely complex network, with power diffused throughout the system. Last year the American Council on Education published a survey which recorded the view of a majority of the nation's presidents that the authority of top administrators over broad policy decisions will continue to diffuse as power extends to faculty, who already have formal policy functions, and to students, who most presidents foresee will become voting members on university committees. Statewide coordinating councils are also expected to have an increasing influence over the public institutions.

Presidents are the favorite targets, as we all know, of the groups whose well-being they attempt to serve, and when the community splinters, they may ever be called upon to hold it together by the sheer majesty of their personalities. It is not surprising that, in April of this year, after the normal season for appointments, 70 presidencies were vacant in four-year institutions and several hundred in junior colleges. Faculties know and appreciate deeply the importance of the president's performance to their own affairs. Professor Sidney Hook puts the point well: "Without administrative leadership, every institution . . . runs downhill. The greatness of a university consists predominantly in the greatness of its faculty. But faculties . . . do not themselves build great faculties. To build great faculties, administrative leadership is essential." The intellectual tone and the morale of an institution are inevitably influenced by the quality of its administration. It follows, naturally enough, that faculty are apprehensive when public events jeopardize the presidential office.

Professors are crucial to all that colleges and universities are and seek to be. McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, states the general view of academic people when he says that the faculty is "the necessary center of gravity of the policies of the university for teaching, for learning, for internal discipline, and for the educational quality and character of the institution as a whole."

The work of faculty will be addressed by other speakers in the conference, so I will limit myself to a few observations about it. Of the several professorial roles, the one that has probably undergone

the greatest change and augmentation since World War II is the research role. Research has been a powerful engine that has made our age more prolific in the expansion of knowledge than any before it, with untold social benefit. Obviously enough, students have been among the principal beneficiaries. Faculty are divided among themselves as to whether the emphasis on discovery has also had unfortunate side effects on the quality of instruction. Students frequently say that it has, and many of them see it as the cause of what they feel to be a neglect of teaching. Massive research and the "publish or perish" syndrome are mainly phenomena of the great graduate centers, however, with much less influence in the four-year and junior colleges, so that this one factor could hardly be the sole explanation of campus unrest.

It may be that the complaint is, at bottom, less against actual neglect than against the intellectual style of the instruction students are getting. Faculty have been trained in the spirit of scientific inquiry, with emphasis on objectivity, rigor, and rationality. They face a generation of students who seek involvement, problem-solving, and commitment. This is the way the generation gap expresses itself inside the colleges and universities. Students are eager to find and to commit themselves to answers for the great social problems—of race, of war, of urban blight, and of a bewildering technological age. This is what is meant by their cries for relevancy, and they are prone to suspect professorial detachment as an excuse for moral neutrality. Students of this persuasion find some faculty who agree with them, particularly among the young and those not yet established, and it is these faculty, I suppose, who are seen by outsiders as abetting campus militancy. Most faculty are deeply imbued with the spirit of objectivity, however, and they cannot easily understand an impulse to leap into the fray of social action without a fair grasp of whatever knowledge may be pertinent. Richard Sullivan, president of the Association of American Colleges, has described the dilemma faculties face in these circumstances. Resisting students risks leaving them unequipped to cope with their chosen social objectives in constructive ways; accommodating to them hazards the sacrifice of some important educational values, including a competent command of subject matter. Accommodation also risks the granting of a license to every faculty member to be "an expert in social ethics," and to cross the line "from education as we have conceived it to propaganda."

Here is one of the great educational issues of the times. Should the colleges and universities remain the disseminators of learning and the detached critics of society they have been, or should they commit themselves to solving specific problems of society? The issue will not be easily resolved, for there are forces without as well as within the institutions which are pressing for commitment, and they are correct in seeing that the academy has much to contribute to society's solutions. Whatever the result, I would hope that the pressures will not be such as to lead faculties to a careless disregard for the limits of their professional competence.

In addition to teaching and research, professors have a significant role in institutional governance. Departmental meetings, committees of all sorts, general faculty sessions, college councils, and university senates require what must to an outsider seem a surprising amount of faculty time. In this capacity, professors perform a function somewhat like that of legislators, enacting the forms of the educational program and the rules under which it will be operated. Their charge to do so is by delegation from the governing board or the president, usually with a veto provision. A statement issued jointly by the Association of Governing Boards, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors states that faculty should have the primary responsibility in curriculum, subject matter, methods of instruction, and degree requirements; faculty status, appointments and terminations of faculty, and tenure; research; and aspects of student life that relate to education. Obviously enough, these are central decisions in any educational process.

It must be said that, in actual practice, faculty participation in governance manifests some significant elements of weakness. A high degree of professionalization has somewhat diluted the sense of loyalty professors feel for the particular institution in which they hold title. It also renders them far more skillful in handling policy matters at the departmental level, where the needs of the single discipline are paramount, than at higher levels where numerous disciplines are fashioned into a liberal arts curriculum. It is frequently at the higher level, unfortunately, that student demands are most intense, and most likely to be frustrated by slow change. Faculties also manifest a curious ambivalence toward policy participation that Archie Dykes exposed nicely in a study issued last fall. Chancellor

Dykes is here at the conference, and I should leave it to him to say what he wishes about the study. One of the striking conclusions is that, whereas faculty cannot conceive of a well-run institution in which they do not play a large policy role, they place it at the bottom of their professional priority list and are reluctant to spend the time it requires. Such debilities of attitude and performance could be cause for skepticism that faculties are capable of meeting their responsibilities, but I am inclined to believe the deeper meaning to be that they need only to live up to their own ideals for themselves.

The work of professors as corporate faculties needs their most serious attention, for unless I am mistaken, events of the past spring—including the actions of the Harvard and Cornell faculties in the face of their troubles—has focused considerable public attention on the corporate role.

Impressions of the new breed of students have been scattered through my earlier remarks, but another observation about them is in order. Students are learners, they always have been and presumably always will be essentially learners, making their individual preparations for work in society. They, too, are coming to have a sense of corporate identity, however, and are more and more seeking a formal role in institutional policy making. The "student power" movement, as young people somewhat exaggeratedly call it, may turn out to be one of the most important educational movements of the times. In saying this, I want deliberately to exclude those few student organizations that are openly directed toward disrupting or destroying the colleges and universities. Their tactics are too often physical and too rarely respectful of the rights of others to deserve honor or influence in an academic community. Relatively few students are revolutionaries, however, and where the revolutionaries appear to have strength, it is generally because they are manipulating issues of importance to numbers of moderate but reform-minded students. We cannot neglect attention to the revolutionaries, but the reformers are the ones to watch. At bottom, they may be guilty of nothing more grave than at last taking seriously the university's age-old claim to being a community of scholars. Believing that students have thus far shared modestly in the benefits of the community, by what an economist might call the spillover principle, they believe now that they are ready to share and to contribute more fully. The strategic trick, for some time to come, is to keep the revolutionaries isolated from the reformers, and to find increasingly fruitful ways to embrace the energies of the latter and larger group.

Faculties are made understandably nervous by the student power movement, since their own power might appear to be threatened. The task of incorporating students more formally into the academic community will not be instant or easy. Scrupulous account will have to be taken of their youth, their lack of certified competence, their short stay in college, and other characteristics that inhere in the role of learning. The policy functions of students should surely be less extensive than their most extreme proponents are claiming, and I am far from suggesting that the institutions should be turned over to them. This would overbalance the sense of community I am espousing. More difficult intellectual accomplishments have occurred before, however. We need another James Madison to write a few Federalist Papers on the proper constitution of an academic community.

The philosophic foundations of such a constitution, I would submit, are already in hand. The tradition of academic freedom is the ground on which faculties have rationalized their own role in governance, in their right to teach and to foster the conditions in which teaching may most effectively take place. The role of students can be rationalized on the same ground, on the companion principle of the right to learn and to espouse those conditions most conducive to learning. Should faculty and students find in the concept of academic freedom the basis for a common constitution, I suspect they would also find the principle on which to stand unified against any barbarian force which would disrupt the educational process by mob demonstration. Surely the professor whose classroom is disrupted, and the students who are prevented from hearing him, have suffered a common insult to their academic freedoms. Unless my ears mislead me, this is what the public is asking of the colleges and universities just now, that they find the ways to assure an orderly enterprise of the intellect. It may even turn out, by a twist of fate, that those elements of the public that have been suspicious of academic freedom in other of its guises will come more perfectly to appreciate it now as, most simply, the right to teach and the right to learn.

These are the principal groups that form the academic community—trustees, administrators, faculty and students. They belong to a complex system, each group manifests some peculiarities and weaknesses, and their relations are sometimes tense. They also have some grand accomplishments to

their credit, and the capacity for more accomplishments for the future. Perhaps all I am saying is that the academic community, like most instruments of the human will, is both imperfect and perfectible. If you will allow me to be playful, I assume this to be true even of state legislatures. What we need in awkward times such as these, inside and outside of the colleges and universities, is cool men with discriminating judgment, who offer and withhold their actions always with an eye to building up the sense of community.

THE FACULTY: WHO THEY ARE, WHAT THEY DO

Wilbert J. McKeachie, Chairman, Department of Psychology
University of Michigan

One of the oldest stories in professor-legislator relations is about the legislator who asked "How many hours does a professor teach?" "About nine hours," came the answer. "Well, that's a fair day's work," the legislator observed.

Old as the story is, I use it as an introduction because I've been asked to talk with you about the professor's job. And when most non-professors learn that professors spend only six to 12 hours a week in classrooms, they wonder how professors spend their time.

I expect that legislators should be a sympathetic audience, for many of you must face a similar problem in explaining to your constituents that the hours you spend on the floor of the legislature are not the only hours you're on the job.

To understand the professor's job we need to look first at what we in the colleges and universities are trying to accomplish.

There are many goals for being in college, and faculty members and administrators also offer many different objectives for colleges—ranging from appreciation of classical scholarship to skill in computer programming. It is no wonder that not all students are satisfied and that student complaints about education are among the prime concerns of student activism.

I am willing to grant that a university has many functions—research, entertainment, matrimonial, and custodial, among others—but for me the main point of college is learning.

What is a college today? I would suggest that we are in the throes of a change in the concept of the college. Formerly we thought of colleges as storehouses of knowledge; their function was to gather knowledge and to transmit it to students. Today we should think rather of the college as a Center of Learning—of Higher Learning²—an institution established by the society to facilitate learning. What kind of learning?

- to learn the best that has been discovered
 - to learn more—to acquire new knowledge
 - to learn how to continue learning throughout one's life.
- (1) The essential process is that of learning—as a verb or a participle, not a noun.
 - (2) The essential characteristic of all members of the community is that they are all learners.
 - (3) The essential characteristic of teaching is to promote learning. The college is a community of scholars and teachers—learners all.

An exploration of the implications of this emphasis on the college as a center of learning seems to me to put some of the current issues in academic life in a more useful framework. They also remind us, or at least they remind me, of some of the essential characteristics of this life to which we have dedicated our energies during these vital years.

Whose responsibility is the student's learning? In the ideal college, students would accept responsibility for themselves; teachers would accept responsibility to help students learn; and administrators would accept responsibility for creating a good climate for learning.

But often each of these groups tries to place the responsibility on the others. Students blame the teacher if the course is dull and they fail to learn: (In fact they blame him even if the course was interesting and they failed to learn.) Teachers, on the other hand, feel that it is up to students to pick

² This is a favorite distinction of my friend, Roger Heyns, and much of what I shall say is borrowed from him.

up the pearls of wisdom that drop from their lips. Administrators think of what a good school they could have if they just did not have students and faculty around creating disturbances that bring down the wrath of alumni and trustees.

What is the Role of Teaching and the Teacher?

When we look at the college as a community of learners the teacher's role is as an expert on the conditions of learning his subject matter. He is a motivator, an analyst, a critic, a setter of standards. He is interested in developing mastery of the subject matter and its methods in his students. There have been recent flurries of interest in teaching machines, T. V., computers and single concept films. Every device that is to the development of learners is the teacher's aid; but these devices cannot replace him as an expert on the conditions of learning and the creative uses of these conditions. Programs, textbooks, television, lab manuals, films and film strips complement the teacher but do not replace him. They only release him from tasks he should have never had. Being the source of information or being the drill master goes back to the Middle Ages. The new educational hardware replaces the teacher in his least important or nonessential functions. It replaces most satisfactorily the least useful, the most mechanical and least imaginative teachers.

The new teaching techniques will not save money—they can, however, release the teacher for essential tasks.

The conception of teaching as promoting learning to learn is not universally accepted—either by professors or by students. For example, we once ran a study in which we compared three methods of teaching—discussion, tutorial, and recitation drill. In recitation drill classes we tried to represent our stereotype of the old drillmaster concept of teaching. We gave a brief true-false quiz almost every class period; we asked specific factual questions and ostentatiously graded students' answers.

In discussion classes we came in with broad general questions involving relationships, applications and implications of the material.

In tutorial classes we simply sat in the classroom consulting with students individually.

Students like recitation drill! Why? My explanation is that students see grades as the primary goal of attending classes. Grades are important for many long term goals. Anxiety about grades is natural and in our recitation classes that anxiety could be controlled.

Anxiety about grades confuses grade achievement with fundamental goals. Grade achievement becomes an end in itself—not an index of learning. Because grades are easy to control, teachers support this motivation. Some students know and protest this subordination of education to grade getting, but in most colleges both teachers and students go along with the system. Should we do away with grades? I think not, but we should do everything possible to make them contribute to education rather than substitute for it.

The conception of the teacher as an expert in learning does not give much emphasis to the teacher as a source of information or to the student as a receptacle. The teacher must of course know his subject. But Heyn's conception would streee knowledge as a concomitant of his skill as a learner rather than as the sine qua non for teaching. The necessity of "knowing one's subject" can be overemphasized—by the teacher and by the student:

- it can lead a teacher to limit his presentations only to what he knows
- it can lead a student to reject methods such as discussion because the knowledge contributed is little
- it is an open invitation to laziness on everyone's part—collusion in which the teacher presents the facts; students record them in their notebooks and no one is pressed to learn or think in any really challenging way. Facts are easy to teach, easy to examine upon, easy to learn.

The teacher we are talking about, who conceives of himself as a fellow learner, attempts to develop in his students the skills of an independent learner—to work himself out of a job. The future

teacher will be much more director - planner - problem poser, much less the walking encyclopedia.

With the conception of the university as a center of learning, scholarship takes on a new cast. Large universities worry about research versus teaching—small colleges say they want teachers, not researchers. The professor's role as a scholar is simply one aspect of his membership in the community of learners. His scholarship is important not just for the knowledge produced but also as a way of being constantly in touch with the problems of laying bare for study the hidden complexities of his field. His scholarship is important as a means of knowing what content is most necessary as a foundation for further learning. His scholarship becomes important also for his role as a model to the younger scholars in his classes and as an element in a climate of scholarship which should pervade the college.

Implications for the teacher role suggest these requirements:

- ability to organize a program of study
- use of resources of learning
- he is a learner with respect to teaching as well as in his field
- there are others who can contribute
- he knows that what he is currently requiring is quickly obsolete.

Huston Smith stated, "College teaching is the difference between giving a person directions to his destination and teaching him how to read a map so that he can go places you've never been."

The good professor is concerned with creating the conditions of discovery—where even in the most elementary matters the student experiences some of the delights and pleasures of profitable, independent discovery, of acquisition of useable valuable skills. The only way to be useful is to have some insight into the meaning of one's actions.

I think all of us teachers must cringe when we think of how often we reduce all the mystery, emphasize the dogmatic and generally make learning dull as ditch digging.

A major barrier to learning is the great dependency of the student on the teacher. He has a fond belief that there is only one way to learn—from a teacher who meets a class Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 9:00 a.m. in a formal classroom. This is closely related to the emphasis on being the source of knowledge.

Teachers must carefully but firmly tear down this primitive idea. We don't find this easy to do. It is not nearly so gratifying. The dependency is flattering to teachers—comfortable for students—it has a seductive appeal.

The teacher must resist manfully all efforts on the part of the student to remain dependent—and we must expect them to be resentful. Conversely the student must resist attempts to keep him dependent. In a community of learners students have responsibility for teacher's learning.

In closing I would like to read the following:

THEME FOR ENGLISH B *

The instructor said,

Go home and write
a page tonight.
And let that page come out of you —
Then, it will be true.

I wonder if it's that simple?

I am twenty-two, colored, born in Winston-Salem.
I went to school there, then Durham, then here
to this college on the hill above Harlem.
I am the only colored student in my class.
The steps from the hill lead down into Harlem,
through a park, then I cross St. Nicholas,
Eighth Avenue, Seventh, and I come to the Y,
the Harlem Branch Y, where I take the elevator
up to my room, sit down, and write this page:

It's not easy to know what is true for you or me
at twenty-two, my age. But I guess I'm what
I feel and see and hear. Harlem, I hear you:
hear you, hear me—we two—you, me talk on this page.
(I hear New York, too.) Me—who?

Well, I like to eat, sleep, drink, and be in love.
I like to work, read, learn and understand life.
I like a pipe for a Christmas present,
or records—Bessie, bop, or Bach.

I guess being colored doesn't make me not like
the same things other folks like who are other races.
So will my page be colored that I write?
Being me, it will not be white.
But it will be
a part of you, instructor.
You are white —
yet a part of me, as I am a part of you.
That's American.
Sometimes perhaps you won't want to be a part of me.
Nor do I often want to be a part of you.
But we are, that's true!
As I learn from you,
I guess you learn from me —
although you're older—and white—
and somewhat more free.

This is my page for English B.

* From Montage of a Dream Deferred by Langston Hughes

HOW FACULTY MEMBERS DO THEIR JOBS: IN A COMPLEX UNIVERSITY

Herman E. Spivey, Professor of English
University of Florida

By noon Saturday, March 1, Professor Everette, University of Florida, had finished reading the first draft of Allen Johnson's doctoral dissertation, which he was directing. As he had indicated in marginal notations here and there, the dissertation would need substantial, but not radical, revision in order to relate the various chapters more clearly and also to distinguish this dissertation more emphatically from one done on a similar theme at the University of Virginia six years ago. If Allen is to receive his doctorate at the June commencement, he would need to begin his revision very soon to meet the May 10 thesis deadline. The committee would need two weeks for reading the final draft and the typist at least ten days to type it in final form. "Maybe I'd better have a conference with him Monday or Tuesday," Professor Everette said, talking to himself (as had become a habit), "and give him some revision suggestions to be thinking over even while two other members of his committee are reading this first draft. It's important that Allen finish this June, or August, at the latest, for he has already accepted a position at the University of Georgia beginning next September. Tomorrow I'll make a few more notes to give him at the conference." So he did the next afternoon, Sunday.

Monday Professor Everette met two classes: one at nine and one at eleven. Somehow the eleven o'clock class did not go to suit him; this phase of the course was always hardest for the students, and the unresponsive expression on the faces of some of them was a depressing signal. He must find a better way to help them toward a readier comprehension of this material. Right after lunch he had a conference with Allen regarding his dissertation and also a conference with Norm Burns, a teaching assistant for whose teaching Professor Everette, as "Big Brother," was responsible. In these periodic conferences with Norm he was able to pick up almost as much help from the zestful teaching assistant as he was able to give. Sometimes he thought Norm was closer to freshmen and understood them better than he, in spite of his twenty years in the classroom. Anyway, whoever gets this young man when he finishes his doctorate will be lucky. It was obvious that Norm was almost like a son—an adopted son, say—to Professor Everette. At 2:30 on this Monday he met with the small departmental committee on the Masters Degree to outline plans and make assignments for the forthcoming comprehensive written examinations which eighteen Master's candidates would be taking week after next. After that short conference Professor Everette worked on his seminar coming up Tuesday evening, determining individualized student assignments he wanted to make for the following week. Also he began preparing his list of books to be put on reserve for a new course he was going to teach next quarter.

Monday evening Professor and Mrs. Everette went to a university concert given by the combined men's and women's choirs that had just returned from a South American concert tour. He went to the concert as much out of loyalty as out of anticipation; but he returned silently singing. What a gifted group of young creative people! Who's afraid of those under thirty!

Tuesday morning Professor Everette worked on his part of the comprehensive Master's exams and also began preparations for his two Wednesday morning classes. Early Tuesday afternoon he reviewed plans for his evening seminar, and from three to five o'clock he participated with 150 of his colleagues in a meeting of the University Senate. The Senate was trying to arrive at consensus on a Senate committee report about a revised code of student conduct—with special reference to more effective patterns of student involvement in university planning and curricula and with reference to faculty agreement on unacceptable methods of protest. (The Student Government Association Senate, at the invitation of the president of the University and the Faculty Senate, was simultaneously considering a somewhat similar, but also somewhat different proposed code drawn up by an official student committee.) That evening, Tuesday, Professor Everette met his graduate seminar, seven to 10, and was impressed again by the splendid interaction of these 16 young men and women—especially with the agile mind of Martha Raye, as mentally quick as she was physically beautiful.

Both classes Wednesday morning went all right, including the one that he had worried about Monday. A class of 60 students is really too big, though, for the successful involvement of many of the students in the discussion part of the class period. In the early afternoon he continued working on his

part of the Master's examinations and spent the latter half of the afternoon in a department meeting discussing the question of whether three or four four-hour or five-hour courses would be better for the student in a given quarter than five or six three-hour courses, as at present. Many students had complained that on the quarter system five or six different courses contributed to the sense of fragmentation; and the Student Senate had asked the faculty to consider revising the curricula so that a student would take fewer courses, with each covering a larger scope. The department could not reach consensus, unfortunately; and after two and one-half hours of debate the department adjourned in a mood of mild frustration, deferring a decision until another day.

Thursday morning two of Professor Everett's Master's-level students came in to talk over the status of their thesis research. Afterward, he prepared for his two Friday morning classes. Thursday afternoon he spent in the research library, continuing preparation of a book on which he had been working for two years and on which he tried to spend two afternoons (and sometimes evenings) per week, whenever classes, seminars, conferences, faculty and committee meetings do not conflict. In the afternoon mail an 18 page manuscript arrived from one of the scholarly journals on whose advisory editorial board Professor Everett served. It would be his duty to evaluate the manuscript promptly and recommend to the editor whether or not the article should be published, with or without revision—and if with revision, the nature of the revision suggested. He couldn't get to this before next week; probably he could do it next weekend.

At each of his two Friday morning classes he asked for a student volunteer who would be willing to administer (at the end of the quarter) the "Course and Instruction" evaluation form developed by the Student Government Association in collaboration with the psychology department, and afterwards he sent a notice to the SGA office indicating the student who would administer the evaluation form and the number of copies that would be needed for each class. In the early afternoon Friday he met with the departmental committee charged with suggesting a revision of doctoral requirements with a view to the possible shortening of the total time required for the degree without lowering the quality of the doctoral program. This committee was to submit a report to be debated and acted on by the whole department early next quarter. Later Friday afternoon Professor Everett met with the Board of Student Publications. The board was to consider a threatened lawsuit by a commercial health organization whose advertisement for sellers of blood had been discontinued because the editorial staff and board had considered the ads as encouraging doubtful health practices. Also on the agenda for this meeting of the Board of Student Publications was a proposed revision of the code of journalistic ethics to govern official student publications. The most sensitive point in the revised code pertained to whether or not a reporter was justified in obtaining information from a source without revealing that the information was to be published.

Friday evening Professor and Mrs. Everett entertained at dinner two of the assistant professors and their wives who were new to the department this year and who had worked out so well that the department was very eager that these young faculty members feel appreciated and wanted as permanent members.

Saturday morning he spent a couple of hours in the research library continuing work on his book, which he now estimated would require about two more years. Later in the morning he completed his portion of the Master's examinations, because the draft of the exams was to be reviewed by the department committee next week. He also prepared for the two Monday morning classes—keenly aware that next week is the last week of classes this quarter and wondering how most effectively he might summarize each of the two classes so that their major emphases might be clear to all.

So concluded one week in the life of a typical professor in a complex university, representative of the variety and multiplicity of activities and concerns of the college professor. Other weeks reflect some of these activities and some others, none less varied, few if any less busy. For instance, some years he spent a few days on an accreditation mission to some other university. Moreover, some of the professors (although not Professor Everett) spent some time in specialized consulting services to government or industry.

Professor Everett was not satisfied this quarter with the amount of scholarly reading he was able to do or the amount of time he was able to spend on the book he had been working on for two years.

However, he was usually able to get more scholarly reading and research done during the fall quarter and especially during the Christmas recess and at the end of the summer.

All in all, he considers the life of a university professor to be a good life!

HOW FACULTY MEMBERS DO THEIR JOBS: IN AN UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE

W. Hugh McEniry, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

The faculty members of large and small institutions do exactly the same things, but they tend to put major emphases on different parts of the common task. There will probably be more attention paid to research in the complex institution, more time spent with students on the small campus. The university professor is prone to place more importance on the decisions made within his own department, while the professor in the college will be more apt to appreciate decisions made by the entire faculty in many matters. Institutional loyalty is easier to find on the college campus; the virtue of loyalty to one's fellow scholars is more likely to be loudly extolled on the complex campus. But the faculty member of a complex campus does spend time with students, does cope with and influence faculty-wide decisions, and does feel the tug of institutional loyalty. At the same time, his counterpart does have research interests, is keenly aware of his disciplinary attachment, and will often speak of his membership in the fraternity of his subject as being prior to his membership in the college. And sometimes, in any two cases, it may be impossible to tell the member of the large faculty from the member of the small.

The really important work of the teacher-scholar is done alone, just as the really important work of the physician, the lawyer or the politician. This is the work that calls for decisions based on individual competence with individual accountability, whether the world ever knows about it or not. For the doctor there is decision about treatment that may cost his patients life or time. For the attorney it is the decision about legal action which may help, hurt, or hazard his client. For the politician it is the decision as to the just compromise by which the business of government is done, and the refusal of the compromise that destroys integrity. For the teacher and researcher, it is the decision about how to lead a student to his own self-discovery, and about how best to allocate time and energies in the pursuit of truth. These determinations are normally worked out in uncertainty.

I am not wise enough to state dogmatically whether the individual or social part of man's life takes precedence; with T. S. Elliot I am inclined to say that neither facet of life can be ignored. But it is the social part of a faculty member's existence that we shall be speaking about in these few minutes. The part that expresses his membership in a group and the business of that group, rather than the part that bodies forth his inviolable private self in teaching and research. There is really not much to say about this latter self except it is engaged as the teacher meets classes and laboratories, publishes articles and books, and counsels students. How he does these things would require many volumes to describe.

Acting as a member of a faculty, however, the teacher's work may be delineated with a little more ease. It is a faculty's business to legislate in some affairs, to make policy for some others, and to advise only in still others. The three functions of legislation, policy making, and advising are many times overlapping, but occasionally absolutely discrete. On a small campus, there are four devices through which the faculty member does most of his community work:

1. The departmental meeting.
2. The committee meeting.
3. The general faculty meeting.
4. The casual conference.

The departmental meeting on a small campus is perhaps the least important method the faculty member employs to get things done. The work is necessary; but, when the members are few, they tend to get things done by informal conference rather than by formal meetings. Still, it is in such meetings or conferences that decisions are made about everyday machinery of the department, textbooks to be used, exams to be given, the stance of the department on college-wide actions, etc.

Much more important as an instrument of the faculty member's involvement is the committee. It might also be called the instrument of confusion. There are committees within departments, and committees of the faculty as a whole. There are committees appointed by the administration for special

tasks and accountable to the administration. The faculty has standing committees and committees limited in tenure and scope. Groups of faculty members may also appoint committees for their own specific purposes. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to keep up with the names and charges of all the committees a campus can and does have, but they are significant.

The teacher does indeed have a double loyalty to his profession as a scholar and to the college to which he is attached for however long a period. He cannot allow the claims of his profession to be diminished because of the pressures of the moment—say from an influential alumnus who wants football more than integrity. Neither can he allow the pressures of his profession to bring his institution to wreck because the college makes necessary compromises to continue viable. For example, he should resist the impatient few who want revolutionary reform at once.

So the committee arises as a watchdog, a source of current information, and as a focus for creative attempts at old or new problems. There are specific committees to keep the faculty informed about what legislators, trustees, and administrators are doing. Others assure the faculty that the latest information about salaries, work loads, research support, etc., is at their disposal. Together, they offer hope that campus problems may be solved rationally.

The college committees usually deal with educational policy, admission and retention of students, student affairs, including parietal regulations, athletics, fringe benefits, honorary degrees, and a host of other matters. They span the spectrum of academic concern.

The faculty on a small campus uses the general faculty meeting as its chief instrument to expedite business. It is in the general faculty meeting that the work of the committees receives attention and debate, and it is at this point that the confusion of committees is compounded into near chaos.

Once a month, or more often, the faculty gathers as a body to hear its reports and discuss the issues. Parliamentary rules are constantly invoked and constantly violated. Parliamentarians are among the busiest people present. The result is engaging, informing, and, unless you are careful, discouraging. It takes a little time to understand that a college faculty meeting is remarkably similar to a town meeting in New England, and that waste motion and wasted verbiage are necessary to the final outcome. Over a long stream of years, during which I have watched faculty meetings rather more than I like to remember, I have come to the reluctant conclusion that there is no substitute. It is amazing how the collective wisdom comes through when, nearly in Thomas Jefferson's words, "Truth is left free to combat error." But I must confess that faculty flirtations with raw passion are shocking enough to keep an outsider wondering, and a dean or president perspiring freely.

While the general faculty meeting is the locus of final and formal decisions, the catalyst for much of the reaction that is productive in a small faculty is the friendly cup of coffee. There, it is still possible to drop in on a colleague and heat up the coffee for a short discussion about any issue that is at mind or hand. This availability of the faculty to each other, and to the administration, makes the informal organization in the college of tremendous import. In large organizations, there is a built-in unwieldiness. In a small college, the ways to cut red tape are well known to almost everybody. If the president's secretary is the important person to know on a certain matter, everybody already knows her. If an assistant professor of history is finally the man to reckon with in negotiating with the department, he is within reach for conversation and persuasion. And so caffeine becomes the symbol of informality pervading the atmosphere of the small college and making it easier to get jobs done.

In this sort of context, the small college faculty member, then, gets his work done largely through committee service, general faculty meetings, and informal conferences. To accomplish this community task, he works about sixty hours a week, according to a survey I made several years ago, and is rewarded by the envy of his friends. They all suppose that a nine-hour teaching load means a nine-hour work week.

HOW FACULTY MEMBERS DO THEIR JOBS: IN A COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Arthur Southerland, Instructor of Music
El Centro College

The comprehensive community college is a microcosm of society at large as a result of the open door policy of admissions practiced by most tax-supported institutions of this type. Accordingly, in a community college classroom will be found individuals as widely diversified in educational background and ability as in physical build and appearance. The senior college and the university on the other hand are likely to be by nature, by economy, or by choice, more selective in population.

Chief among the goals of the community college is to take the student from where he is at his time of entry through this open door and carry him as far as his ability, his desire, and his time permit before he seeks or is pulled through an exit. Symbolically, the revolving door is more descriptive of the student's potential relationship to the community college, with his ability to come back again and again to be a participant in a wide variety of curricula.

The wants and needs of each unique personality and the philosophies and the objectives of the community college converge at the feet of the faculty member. It is his responsibility to join and weld these forces into a manageable tool called education. Originally education's purpose was to transmit to each succeeding generation the knowledge and skills of the culture in which the young would mature and live. In most instances the learning process was readily recognizable as essential to survival. (For example, very few dropouts were found in the tiger hunting class.) The development of society into its present-day complexity has brought, in many instances, a gap between the information imparted in educational institutions and the apparent application of those materials to life. Due to the student's desire for immediate self-improvement, the community college faculty is in a new way called upon to seek to bring relevance of his subject matter to the daily experiences of the student.

All of the aforementioned factors assign to the faculty member in the community college his primary task—teaching. Every other function of the faculty member in this branch of higher education is an adjunct to instruction; therefore, his work load is fundamentally concerned with the teaching process. The time he spends in counseling often involves guidance of the student toward the teacher, the course, and/or the program best suited for him. Research in the community college is justified almost exclusively as an evaluation of and exploration for the excellence of instruction. In-service training for faculty members of the community college springs from the need to acquire new insights into techniques and materials for the improvement of instruction.

There is no "typical" community college student, unless he is typical because he, like all the other of his peers, is different from all the rest. The instructional process then, cannot be standard. And, the community college faculty member must frequently readjust his procedures from the kind of teaching which he received in college wherein all were expected to learn the same materials and to do so in the same way. Some faculty personnel spend all or a part of their time on administrative duties, and even their colleagues in the classroom may lose sight of the fact that these chores are but another facet of the institution's support force for the front line corps of instructors. A growing area of interest for the community college teacher is the faculty association, most often organized as a volunteer body banded together to establish and maintain communication among the faculty, the administration, and the students. These faculty groups make recommendations to and exchange ideas with their superiors, and without exception they function best when their efforts are concerned with the sharing of perceptions regarding the total instructional environment of the college. As faculty associations narrow their activities to labor union tactics, effectiveness degenerates.

In the ways previously enumerated the community college teacher works in one or more of at least three types of programs which are found in this educational framework: (1) college transfer programs, (2) technical-occupational programs, and (3) community service or continuing adult education courses. A fourth area, pre-college remedial work, might also be included as a vital stage. And, the teacher is called upon to prove that unity can exist without uniformity; for, he works within the stated philosophies and policies of the college but in a manner determined by the program and the person. In this regard, the instructor's role parallels that of the farmer, as both are concerned with

reclamation, conservation, and cultivation for growth. No community college student is expected to fail. In order to fail completely, to be "washed out" of the institution, the student must ignore the large number of alternatives of major pursuits, and instructional methods surrounding him. Because of this philosophical position, the teacher in such an institution serves, willingly or unwillingly, as a unique force in academic and socio-economic mobility among the students of the college.

On a broader scale, there are implications for the community college teacher beyond the local institution. A need exists for greater interest in professional affiliations in groups working toward the betterment of teaching. Such organizations and community college teachers as individual citizens are generally behind their colleagues in our sister institutions in sharing information with their legislators, who must regularly make decisions which ultimately concern the classroom and the instructional process.

WHAT IS THE FACULTY'S ROLE IN INSTITUTIONAL DECISION-MAKING?

Henry L. Mason, Chairman, Department of Political Science
Tulane University

Governing a university or college is radically different from governing a country or a business enterprise because of the particular purpose of the academic institution. Its basic aims are two: to teach students and to advance human learning through intellectual creativity. Both of these tasks involve intimate personal relationships—between the professor-teacher and his student, and between the professor-researcher and his subject matter. To nurse these relationships in the most creative academic environment is the real challenge for university government. Accordingly, and this is by no means an exaggeration or mere slogan, we must insist that all the activities of the university be secondary and subservient to the activities pertaining to teaching and research.

This order of priorities impresses on the university a non-hierarchical form of organization—neither autocratic nor democratic in nature. The people “on top” are not necessarily the trustees, the president, or the deans, but in many situations the professor-teachers in their lecture halls and seminars and the professor-researchers in their studies and laboratories. Governing the university must involve the teacher-researcher “on the assembly line” because he knows intimately what the “production” of the university is all about; only the immediate proximity to the personal tensions of learning and scholarly creation gives legitimacy to much of the decision-making for the academic community. At the same time, however, the teacher-researcher must limit his participation in academic governance so that he can remain a fully performing professor instead of becoming an occasional scholar. In other words, university administrators exist to enable professors to remain professors, just as hospital administrators enable physicians to remain physicians. Both university and hospital administrators are successful to the extent that their day-to-day governing can incorporate the policy preferences and other insights of the working professor or the working physician. The challenge of academic administration, thus, is truly severe. It involves much more than exercising leadership from the top of a hierarchical structure like a government department in Washington or an industrial plant in Detroit; it also involves knowing how to receive “orders” from the professor “down” on the assembly line who by the very nature of the academic business happens to know more about certain crucial, highest-level production questions than the administrator “on top.” The dean cannot survive without the governing cooperation of the professor; the professor cannot remain a professor if the dean does not know how to adopt—and adapt—the governing wisdom of the professor while still relieving the professor of most of the governing tasks. It should be emphasized that this view of academic government in fact elevates rather than demeans the deans’ tasks; if they do their job properly, they are indeed the heroes of university governance. Many professors do not appreciate this complexity of the deans’ tasks; neither, unfortunately, do quite a few deans.

The structures of university government reflect, or should reflect, the unique, non-hierarchical nature of the university. These structures usually include the following: the board of trustees; the so-called administration organized along rather hierarchical lines with a president, a provost, vice presidents, and deans divided into academic, student-life, and “business” jurisdictions; a university senate usually consisting of administration and faculty representatives; a general faculty assembly; general faculty assemblies of the various colleges and schools; and, last but certainly not least, departmental faculties. Moreover, committees perform important tasks at most of these structural levels, and student members are increasingly featured on these committees and also on their parent bodies. The main point about these layers of structures is that none is in fact superior to any of the others, at least not all the time. Decision-making in a university usually involves most of the structures cited above, with various degrees of influence. For each type of decision, so to speak, there is a different mix of influence of the various structures. But, no structure is dominant all the time—even though the board of trustees, or the president, or the department, for example, may appear dominant at times. De facto, there is no supreme power in the university; the key characteristic is the interdependence of the various structures and components. This interdependence and the resulting diffusion of authority certainly do not make for neat or efficient decision-making. Yet, any administrative reform in a more hierarchical direction would adversely affect the efforts at the

all-important "production" level of teaching and research.

Two further points involving the uniqueness of university governance must be mentioned. First, the more disagreeable effects of the diffusion of power cannot be relieved by dividing the decision-making task into an academic sector where the faculty would dominate, and a financial sector where the administration and/or the board of trustees would be supreme. Unfortunately, all financial decisions in a university directly and immediately affect academic policy, and vice versa. Second, the labor-management model has no real significance in an academic institution. Professors are not employees of the university, just as physicians are not employees of a hospital. As was mentioned above, professorial insights—because of the very nature of their duties—must play a crucial role in the management of the institution. Union officials representing professors would be distant from the intimate core of the academic process, and—what is even more important—the built-in antagonism of the labor relations model would greatly endanger the one factor which makes the diffusions of the university structure tolerable: the trust and sense of academic community among the various structures and components. Creation of a "class" barrier between administration and faculty would signify the end of any kind of meaningful governance of the university.

2. Structures

(a) The Board of Trustees. In a legal sense, but in a legal sense only, the board of trustees is supreme in the university—at least, in the private university. In reality, on the solid evidence of the experience of most reputable universities, the board interferes only sporadically and even superficially with a university's decision-making. After all, the board is composed of persons whose university duties require perhaps three or four hours per week or less, persons who come from non-academic milieus—usually the law or business. The board's real functions are two: to serve as overall financial guide and as representative of, and to, the outside public. The board makes the basic investment and certain overall budgetary decisions in the case of a private institution; in the case of a public university, it involves itself with the general appropriation before the legislature and the governor. But, these financial duties of the board are by no means to be compared with the budget powers of, for example, a parliament or, even less, an exchequer. The specific educational-research output of a university is to a considerable extent determined by financial decisions, but by financial decisions which are made, *de facto*, by the other decision-making centers of the university, not by the board. The board provides ultimate financial limits concerning the size of the cake, but the crucial decisions on the size of the various slices are made by full-time academics. In its second function, as representative of the outside public, the board acts in a watchdog capacity—it reminds the university that it is part of "ordinary" human society, and that society may impose definite limits either on academic aloofness from or on academic involvement with the outside culture. In the most favorable sense, the board shields the university from dysfunctional public pressures; or, far less acceptably, the board tells the university what "extremes" of academic freedom cannot be tolerated. Boards are necessary to remind the academics of the financial and societal realities and limits of the world we live in. Mature, far-sighted boards have creatively contributed to academic excellence.

(b) The Administration. Under this rather misleading heading—misleading because it too much recalls governmental or business hierarchies—fall the president, the vice presidents, the provost and deans, and various other university officials. Three general types of administrative officers can be distinguished: those concerned with academic affairs; those responsible for the non-academic side of student life; those responsible for the "business" affairs and physical plant of the university. This division is far too simple—for example, the directors of admissions, of financial aid and of students records, and the librarian fall between these categories.

The president is at the head of the administrative structure, yet his controls are by no means complete nor are they necessarily hierarchical in nature. In fact, most of the attention of the president in all but mini-institutions (with fewer than, let's say, 1,800 students), is probably devoted to other interests than those covered by the above-mentioned three administrative divisions. Not only is the president the ceremonial head of the university with all the incredibly time-consuming tasks which that apparently must entail, but much of his time is devoted to fund raising, public relations, alumni relations, relations with the board, relations with government, relations with other universities. Only the "business" and especially the physical plant side of the administration are reasonably much under

presidential supervision, and even here vice-presidents for finance can be notably independent and may enjoy direct channels of communications to the board of trustees. The non-academic side of student life is partly becoming a major sphere of student jurisdiction, partly being controlled by psychologist-type specialists, and partly being absorbed by expanding faculty jurisdictions. The dean of students, with his traditionally close ties to the president, is more and more disappearing as an important agent of decision-making. It could be said that in the sphere of student life the president nowadays attempts to intervene only in times of crisis. Of course, crises have been constant during the last two years precisely in this sphere—and it can safely be stated that presidential crisis-management here has been rather spotty in quality (to say the least), generally reflecting the president's lack of expertise in student affairs.

On the academic side of administration, presidential leadership and control often are virtually non-existent. The closer we get to the heart of the university, teaching and research, the more diffuse authority must be. In the reputable universities the crucial and the routine academic decisions are made by academic vice-presidents or provosts and deans in close cooperation with segments of the faculty. And even in less reputable universities, where this cooperation is much less than perfect, it is the deans rather than the president who make academic policy.

This description of university administration is intended to downgrade the image of the president as it is sometimes seen by the outside world as a result of its ignorance of the essential diffusion of academic decision-making. On the other hand, there is no intent to downgrade the real role of the president. It is in many ways a thankless role and one remarkably far removed from the spheres of action academicians like to occupy themselves with. The sheer time burdens of office are incredibly heavy, and the somewhat dubious sole compensation for innumerable frustrations may be in the prestige attributed to the presidential position by the outside world. Nevertheless, a president can put his stamp on a university. Precisely by being aware of his own limits of power, he can subtly affect policy in innumerable situations. In fact, merely by the example of his academic and personal style, a president can make a university greater—or not so great.

(c) Levels of Faculty Participation. The faculty exercises its influence on university decisions at many levels, from the university-wide senate to the department representing a single academic discipline. The department, closest to teaching and research, is undoubtedly the most important academic decision-maker in the university—besides, of course, the individual academic teacher himself. It is not only part of the university but also part of the nationwide, or even worldwide, community of scholars of a particular discipline. The faculty members of a department are tested and certified by their standing in that discipline, which, to some extent at least, serves to shelter them from the parochialisms and aberrations of a particular institution. Many departments have remained small enough to permit all the members to participate directly in departmental decision-making; a departmental chairman should be truly a *primus inter pares* who may be successfully challenged even by rather junior colleagues. The department makes most of the important decisions about teaching (and to a lesser degree about research), and it cannot easily be overruled by other decision-makers in the university. Of course, conditions in many departments may not be quite as pleasant as depicted here. Personal feuds, despotism, sheer laziness, cronyism, etc., may prevail at times or—in some situations—even all the time. Where the department fails, the university will be so much more ineffective. However, none of the other decision-makers or decision-making levels in the university can do very much to improve individual departments instantaneously. In the real world of the university, good teaching and research departments grow slowly but cannot be created—nor bought—overnight by deanly or presidential intervention.

The next levels of faculty participation, the general faculty assembly of a particular university division and the general faculty assembly of the university as a whole, are not always known for their effectiveness. A group of from two hundred to twelve hundred or more faculty members, representing twenty to forty departments, can present unbelievably frustrating parliamentary situations. The general faculty assembly does not have political parties to regulate and lubricate the conduct of business; the frequently present quasi-parties, the “liberals” and the “non-liberals,” are usually quite unrelated, as such, to the academic business at hand. Moreover, the departmental cores within the general faculty assembly can produce unparalleled patterns of log-rolling, senatorial courtesy, and attachment to the

status quo. Yet, a number of important decisions have to be reached at the university-wide faculty level—those involving that minimal amount of centralization of effort which the departments by their very nature tend to oppose. It is at this point that the saving efforts have to be made by a coalition of faculty leaders working closely with the presiding dean of the college or perhaps the provost. This in turn requires the existence of respected, legitimate faculty leaders. The typical faculty member instinctively objects to faculty leaders whose main motivation appears to be political; the only accepted faculty leader is the one whose primarily scholarly motivation and scholarly success are beyond dispute—yet, the best scholars frequently have no interest in faculty leadership. Therefore, general faculty assemblies can be effective only to the extent that devoted scholars of the university can be induced to take a hand in general faculty leadership. It is in the handling of such paradoxical situations that academic deans should play their most creative roles, as they appeal to the genuine faculty leaders and the faculty “masses.”

University senates can be the most productive level of faculty participation in university-wide academic governance, featuring built-in mechanisms for close cooperation with the administration as well as the convenience of manageable size. (Where senates exist, university-wide general faculty assemblies tend to disappear or be used for appeal purposes only.) For obvious reasons the so-called “pure” senate, i.e., a senate containing faculty representatives only, is not nearly as effective as a senate containing both faculty representatives and administrative officials—in a suggested faculty-administration proportion anywhere from 2:1 to 6:1. The administration representatives should include the president, the vice-presidents, the provost, and the academic deans. The faculty should be represented in a proportional manner according to the size of a college or other division of the university, with each division being guaranteed a minimum of one or two elected senators. The total membership of the senate should be as close as possible to 50 senators, with the maximum certainly not exceeding 80-90 senators. Meetings should be held at least once a month during the academic year. Again, if the right kind of faculty representatives can be elected to the senate and if the senate can develop a truly senatorial *esprit de corps*, then it might become the agent which will produce consensus among faculty and administration and move the university in the required direction. It must be emphasized that a university senate is not in a hierarchical relationship to the president; neither can it intervene at will in the jurisdictions of the departments or the colleges. To make a crucial point once again, considerable academic and political skills are needed to arrive at senate decisions which will be appropriate to and accepted by the entire university community—skills which will have to be displayed by the president and the deans as well as the faculty leaders. Thankless brokerage roles will have to be undertaken by both sides, roles which will be assumed only where devotion to the academic community is of the highest quality on the part of both faculty and administration.

(d) Instruments of Student Participation. The model of university decision-making presented here does not provide much scope for student participation, but for reasons of space very little elaboration can be made on this point. Basically, the students' participation in decisions on teaching and research can only be minor; the student is the apprentice whom the university introduces to these innermost academic processes. The apprentice-status makes active participation in this decision-making a contradiction in terms; the student cannot contribute to decisions on matters which he has not yet mastered for the very reason that he has come as student to the university to attain mastership.

However, some student participation does seem logical. First of all, of course, there is no reason why students should not have even a predominant voice in the running of their own non-academic affairs. In the second place, some student representatives should be elected to all the structures of faculty participation and to the administration-faculty senate, to reflect and communicate their experiences as “consumers” of the academic process. Particularly in the many specialized committees at the departmental, college, and university-wide levels students can play extremely important, but minority, roles. The traditional student government could survive for the regulation of non-academic aspects; the more serious, yet basically passive, student involvement in the academic affairs of the university would require new methods of student representation, perhaps organized through a student's academic department.

Of course, the limited role here assigned to students in academic decisions might be badly received among student masses that have been exposed to the ideologies of student power and

anti-establishmentism. And, in any case, the students form a very decided majority on the campus, which presents problems of physical force and violence. Again, this paper cannot possibly undertake an excursion into causes and cures of student violence, but it can safely be stated that the above depicted facts of diffusion of authority on the campus, with the resulting inevitable bias toward the status quo and inaction, have affected our present student revolt scene.

In summary, faculty participation in academic decision-making is assumed as essential for the quality of the university. At the same time, neatly delineated spheres of jurisdiction and sovereignty cannot be provided in the diffuse and non-hierarchical set-up of the university—making participation even less attractive to the non-activist faculty members, while provoking devil theories of administrative tyranny among the activists. Moreover, the impracticality of academically respectable yet effective mass organization of the faculty makes for dependence upon an elite of faculty leaders and faculty brokers at the various levels of participation—brokers who at their best are real representatives of the scholarly concerns of the faculty. The heart of academic decision-making lies in the quality and intensity of the consultation processes between the faculty-brokers and the academic dean. If these two parties act in the interest of the university as a whole rather than of their own components, if they are convinced of the supreme importance of the teaching-research process and its essential feedback on decision-making, and if they are sufficiently non-psychopathic to get along as human beings—then, the necessary diffusion of authority in the non-hierarchical organization of the university will still result in direction rather than chaos.

GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND DECISION MAKING IN THE UNIVERSITY: AN ADMINISTRATIVE VIEW

Archie R. Dykes, Chancellor
The University of Tennessee at Martin

First, I want to state my basic position with respect to decision making in the university. I believe that decision making must be cooperative, that all segments of the academic community must have a systematic way through which participation in the decision-making process can be secured. This position rests on a basic assumption that decisions so made will be of higher quality and more effectively carried out. It argues that lack of involvement produces unconcern and lack of effective responsibility.

Moreover, if among the purposes of education are those of making our democracy increasingly responsive to the will of the people and enhancing of the dignity and worth of the individual, then how the educative process is controlled becomes a matter of urgent concern. John Dewey, more than three decades ago, stated at one and the same time the nature of the problem and its implications for a democratic society:

The way in which any organized social interest is controlled necessarily plays an important part in forming the dispositions and tastes, the attitudes, interests, purposes and desires, of those engaged in carrying on the activities of the group. . . . The principle applies with special force to the school. . . . Whether this educative process is carried on in a predominantly democratic or non-democratic way becomes, therefore, a question of transcendent importance not only for education itself but for its final effect upon all the interests and activities of a society that is committed to the democratic way of life.¹

To assume that our universities can contribute to the strength and vitality of democracy without themselves being examples of democracy in action is naive. It is too much to expect faculties to instill in the young appreciation and understanding of the democratic way when they themselves do not have a voice in decisions of importance to them. The delicate and difficult task of developing faith and confidence in democracy as a social system cannot be accomplished in an institution which does not itself exemplify in spirit and in practice the basic requirements of democratic processes.

Recent developments in higher education have created perplexing dilemmas for faculty participation in the governance of the academic community. As has been noted, effective faculty participation in academic decision-making processes is essential in a democratic society. Yet, the ability of faculties to play a meaningful role in decision making is increasingly challenged as institutions grow larger and more complex and as the decision-making processes become more bureaucratized and formalized.

The organizational arrangements through which faculties have traditionally participated in decisions no longer seem to secure the desired degree of participation, and dissatisfaction with what some members of the professoriate view as their lack of effective participation appears to be growing. The more mordant critics have become outspoken in denouncing the "bureaucratization" of today's colleges and universities, what they perceive to be "administrative arbitrariness," increasing reliance on "hierarchical" as opposed to "collegial" authority, and the legerdemain whereby, it is argued, mock recognition is given to faculty participation in decisions.

Faculty members themselves possess a rather pervasive ambivalence toward their involvement in the decision-making processes. Most faculty members argue the faculty as a body should have a strong, active, and influential role in decisions, especially in those areas directly related to the educational function of the university. Yet, many of them individually reveal a strong reticence to give the time such a role would require, and not infrequently place participation in institutional affairs at the bottom of their professional priorities. One faculty committee, after studying involvement of its own faculty in

¹ John Dewey, "Democracy and Educational Administration," *School and Society*, 45:460, April 3, 1937.

institutional decision making, asserted that the greatest obstacles to effective faculty participation were lack of interest, apathy, and a reluctance to accept responsibility.

Clearly, if faculties wish the strong, active role in decision making which they claim as a prerogative, they must be willing to give the time such a role demands. And if they value their influence in institutional affairs, they must be willing to give such activity a higher priority among their interests and concerns. As Robert MacIver has noted, "An institution cannot be well governed unless each of its components clearly recognizes its obligations as well as its rights in the promotion of the common end."²

Both faculty members and administrators must show more flexibility and imagination in adapting to the new requirements of effective participation. Nostalgia for the town meeting type of university government profoundly influences faculty attitudes toward participation. When colleges and universities were small, internal complexity was nonexistent, and teaching and research were carried on under relatively simple conditions, direct democracy provided adequate accommodation for faculty participation in university government. But now that colleges and universities have grown larger and more complex and the character of the campus has changed, direct democracy is no longer a viable concept.

If the ideal of the always-watchful, perpetually vocal faculty, deeply involved with every issue to be decided, became a reality in today's large university, the result would be chaos. Each faculty member would have to shoulder the intolerable burden of keeping fully informed about and active in all issues while at the same time, managing his scholarly and disciplinary obligations. Moreover, direct participation by such large numbers would paralyze the governmental machinery. There must be a division of labor in the governance of today's large complex university; in short, it is necessary to move from town hall to representative government.

The devices of direct democracy are now cumbersome and impractical, and faculties must increasingly turn to representative techniques if they are to speak with an effective voice. As other observers have noted, "If a faculty is to be influential . . . it must be able to decide as well as to deliberate. And faculties today are not as well organized for decision and action as they are for deliberation."³

On most large university campuses, inadequate communications systems hinder faculty participation in decisions. Administrators—who have better access to information concerning institutional decisions—must assume the initiative in making information available to the faculty. Moreover, administrators, from system-wide officers to the department chairman, largely control the formal systems of communication. If these are not functioning properly, they must take a large measure of the blame.

Of even greater import, however, is the extent to which administrative officers are committed to keeping the faculty informed. Too often, the commitment is not strong and little effort is made to provide necessary information to the faculty on a regular and systematic basis. In some cases, regrettably, the neglect is deliberate.

Often, too, faculties are not informed of pending decisions in sufficient time to influence them or to seek involvement in the decision-making process. Unfortunately, many decisions of greatest import to faculties come to them as a fait accompli.

Finally, the source of much of the tension between faculty and administration is a conviction held by many faculty members and administrators that any increase in the power and influence of one must necessarily result in a decrease in the other. The administration and the faculty are seen as adversaries competing for a limited quantity of influence. Any power or influence which the administration secures must inevitably reduce the influence of the faculty, and vice versa.

²Robert M. MacIver, *Academic Freedom in Our Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 73.

³Francis E. Rourke, and Glenn E. Brooks, *The Managerial Revolution in Higher Education* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966), p. 129.

Such a perception is both invalid and seriously misleading. Given the nature of the large university today, it is possible for administrative and faculty power to increase simultaneously. Any increase in administrative power which improves the efficiency and effectiveness of the total organization potentially increases the power of the faculty, since the total power is increased, and vice versa. For example, a weak administration, easily manipulable by forces from outside the university, jeopardizes the faculty's autonomy and reduces its power. In such a case increases in administrative strength obviously enhance faculty influence. Similarly, the centralization of certain business and ancillary functions may strengthen the administration, but, at the same time, may enable the faculty to exercise greater control by effectively influencing the policies governing the operation of such functions.

New perspectives about this particular aspect of administrative/faculty relationships, therefore, seem long overdue. A clear dichotomy between administrative power and faculty power does not exist. Rather, faculty power and administrative power are, in a sense, fused, and each depends in considerable measure on the other. So long as the administration views the faculty as its natural adversary competing for a limited amount of power and influence, and vice versa, neither the faculty nor the administration will have the strength its responsibilities warrant. The most unfortunate consequence of such a circumstance is that it forestalls effective educational leadership.

GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND DECISION MAKING IN THE UNIVERSITY: A FACULTY VIEW

Robert R. Wright
Professor of Law, University of Arkansas

I would first like to compliment Dr. Mason on an excellent presentation of the faculty view on the decision-making process in universities. What I have to add are some observations intended to supplement Dr. Mason's comments, most of which have particular reference to state universities. I do not intend, of course, to make my own comprehensive evaluation of the subject, since Dr. Mason has rather thoroughly explored the faculty view.

First, with respect to the basic aims of state universities, I would add one more relationship other than those of professor-teacher and professor-researcher. This relationship pertains to the fact that state institutions (and land-grant universities in particular) have a peculiar obligation to be of service in a variety of ways to the states which support them. This function is served through extension programs of various types, through continuing education in various fields, through cooperative research with state agencies, and through varying forms of advisory functions.

The individual faculty member is thus sometimes thrust beyond the confines of pure academic research into a setting in which he must deal on an advisory or research basis with actual social and economic problems within the state. This can be an exciting and challenging experience for him and can be quite rewarding in terms of recognizing the practical problems and exigencies which exist in state government in particular and in society in general.

The university administration should quite obviously encourage and attempt to promote situations in which faculty are able to participate actively in this type of endeavor. Indeed, I believe state universities have an obligation in this regard. Administrators should recognize the obligation and faculty members should take advantage of such opportunities for public service and for putting into practice some of their ideas. Moreover, state governments should be aware of these potential sources of knowledge and assistance and should realize that if adequate funds are made available to the state institutions to fulfill the basic teaching obligations, these institutions will be better able to make professional assistance available in areas in which it might prove profitable.

Some people have too often been possessed of a peculiar attitude toward academicians—the implicit thought that they somehow constitute a portion of society's dropouts or at best are a bit odd. The more ignorance prevails as the order of the day in a state legislature, the more often the most common and shortsighted of the common denominators dominates the thinking of the whole, the more often a state legislature is possessed of a Jacksonian populist or William Jennings Bryan "status quo uber alles" attitude—in any of these events, the more often good minds go wasting in needful states and ultimately go elsewhere to states whose governments and people are more enlightened, whose battles are those of the twentieth century and beyond and not those of times long past. The past in the field of education belongs to those who wish only to wallow in the backwaters of the future.

Secondly, I would observe that when Professor Mason refers to the fact that administrators must realize that the activities of the administration must be geared to promoting the basic activities and functions of the university, which are teaching and research, he has stated the real thesis on which all universities have to be based. Some years ago, I was an officer and assistant general counsel of a fairly large corporation which was in the wood products, paper and chemicals field. The business of the administration of that corporation, and its legal department as well, was in promoting production and sales and in securing a good profit for the shareholders. All of us, in a sense, from the president on down were servants to these purposes. If you could understand a problem better by going out into the mills and taking a look at the situation first-hand, then that was the way to do it.

Now a university, to be sure, is not like a corporation. If anything, as Professor Mason has indicated, it should be less hierarchical. There should be constant contact between the top-level administrators and the people on the production line, who are, of course, the faculty. The product of a university is measured in terms of the human beings who graduate from it, the research and writing and

ideas which emanate from it, and in the service which it renders to society in general. So presidents and vice-presidents, with all their multitude of other problems—financial and political and keeping the students from burning the place down and so on—must of necessity know what it is that the Department of Chemistry needs to improve it, and why the College of Arts and Sciences needs to alter its requirements, and how the approach to law teaching is changing, and what new requirements have been imposed which mean the restructuring of a given discipline or the drastic upgrading of its library holdings.

In short, administrators must never lose sight of what their purpose is and what the real function of the university is and how they fit into the scheme of things. My own experience has been that top-level administrators understand these things much better than second-line or third-line people in the administration. Many of these people seem to live by the computer. If they have the computer trained to do certain tricks every Thursday, they don't want to be bothered with a new grading system or some new procedure which may have important academic ramifications. They will resist it until the point when you obtain what they regard as the equivalent of a "court order," which is a directive from the president or a vice-president. You particularly run into this state of affairs with people who have been with an institution so long that they can remember when the ivy began to climb the walls of the oldest building on campus. Quite obviously, these people have long since forgotten—if they ever knew—what a university is all about and what its functions are. As far as they are concerned, the faculty are hired hands. When top administrators run across people like this, they need to either change the attitudes of these people or get rid of them, because in the long run, they are either going to retard or fail to serve the best interests of the university.

One other observation which I would briefly like to make pertains solely to state universities, and it is something which plagues administrators and faculty members alike. That is the fact that in practically every state, some gathering of clerks in the shadow of the State Capitol have produced a set of rules and regulations for all state agencies. The fact that institutions of higher learning bear only limited relationship to the State Highway Department or the State Revenue Department seems never to have occurred to them, and it is doubtful that it ever crossed their mind in the first place. There are a substantial number of these regulations which can reasonably apply to universities and colleges, but there are also at least some of them which have no rationale in an academic environment.

Lastly, I would like to make an observation which is strictly my own, and which I doubt very seriously that you would hear come from the mouth of most academicians. Within their sphere of knowledge, most faculty members are quite adept; but when they depart very much from the academic sphere with which they are familiar and begin to get into matters which affect the overall administrative functioning of the university, only a limited number are able to think on that level with as much knowledgeability and practicality as they were able to exhibit while they were on more familiar ground. A few of them, who quite often are most vocal, are sufficiently inhibited in their thinking by the desire to project a liberal image of which their colleagues will approve that they wander off into a sort of never-never land where logic and reason become subordinated.

This is one of the problems, I think, in dealing with student agitation and unrest. These people invariably have a following, and administrators have to treat them with some seriousness. This is the other side of the coin, and it accounts for much of the difficulty in the relationship between legislatures and universities. It doesn't mean, however, that legislators should automatically view college campuses as a haven for the fuzzy-minded. College faculties quite clearly include in their number some of the most capable men in the country, and despite some of the shortcomings I have mentioned, our state governments would be foolish not to give every possible means of financial support available to their institutions of higher learning. Colleges, by their very nature, are seedbeds of change, and most of it is for the better.

One reason I mention all this is that faculties are increasingly participating in policy-making decisions, which in turn increasingly go outside of the traditional academic realm. This trend is going to continue. So along with this growth of faculty power must come the realization that if one is going to help lead the way, he needs to have a pretty good idea of where he intends to go and the most reasonable way to get there.

THE TENURE SYSTEM AS VIEWED BY A FACULTY MEMBER

C. Addison Hickman, Vandever Professor of Economics
Southern Illinois University

I hope to accomplish two things during the next 20 minutes. As the first panelist, perhaps I can set the stage a bit for my colleagues and for the ensuing discussion by asking at the outset: What is the tenure system, and why has it been established and preserved? As the panelist presuming to represent the faculty, if there is a distinctively faculty point of view about tenure, which I rather hope there really is not, I will try to find and present it.

Our American experience with tenure in higher education goes well back into the 19th century, but most of the definitive statements about the tenure system date from the establishment of the American Association of University Professors in 1915. Since that date, the AAUP has formulated, usually in conjunction with the other major associations and with the collaboration of hundreds of colleges and universities, a series of landmark statements about tenure, due process, and academic freedom, which seem to be inseparably connected. A recent compilation of these statements summarizes their essence in this fashion:

Academic freedom requires that a professor should receive effective protection of his economic security through a tenure system which should provide at least these safeguards: 1. A probationary period of stated length, the maximum conforming to a national standard. 2. A commitment by an institution of higher education to make a decision in advance of the end of the probationary period whether a permanent relationship will be entered into; collaterally, national standards of notice for such decisions. 3. Appointment to a tenure post if a person is continued beyond the limit of the probationary period. 4. Termination of a tenure appointment only because of age under an established retirement system, financial exigency, or adequate cause.¹

These tenure provisions, it has long been agreed, should be coupled with "due process" if charges which might lead to denial or termination of tenure are brought. "Due process" in termination proceedings should provide safeguards generally similar to those afforded by due process in legal proceedings, together with such adaptations to the academic environment as participation by a faculty body in the decision-making. "Academic freedom, tenure, and academic due process thus form a triad which brings together the deep regard of the civilized world for knowledge and the practical forms of protection needed by academic workers."²

Why has such a tenure system been established in American higher education, and why has it been preserved with such concern and determination? Is this merely an attempt to give faculty members job security, such as many others in our society now have, or does tenure go deeper than this? The "1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure," which has been approved by virtually all the major associations in higher education and which now constitutes the basis for institutional policy at most colleges and universities, roots the tenure system squarely in the desire to maintain academic freedom. The "1940 Statement" asserts:

Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition.

Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advance-

¹ Louis Joughin, ed., *Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 5-6.

² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

ment of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.

Tenure is a means to certain ends; specifically: (1) Freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security, hence, tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society.³

An eloquent statement of the link between academic freedom and tenure, and the necessity to preserve both, has been made by Fritz Machlup.⁴ He argues that, to preserve the public interest in free inquiry and the generation of new ideas, professors need more than the Constitutional guarantee of free speech and its protection from being jailed for expression of their thought. They also need protection from arbitrary dismissal. Machlup observes, "The dismissal of a professor from his post not only prevents him from performing his function in society, but, by intimidating thousands of others and causing them to be satisfied with 'safe' subjects and 'safe' opinions, it also prevents the entire profession from effectively performing its function."⁵

Machlup points out that it is in the interest of society that men in some occupations—lawmakers, judges, professors, clergymen, and journalists, for example—speak their minds without fear of retribution. This social interest has been recognized by the special immunities given legislators and judges, and by the academic tenure system. Machlup concludes in these often-quoted words:

The occupational work of the vast majority of people is largely independent of their thought and speech. The professor's work consists of his thought and speech. If he loses his position for what he writes or says, he will, as a rule, have to leave his profession, and may no longer be able effectively to question and challenge accepted doctrines or effectively to defend challenged doctrines. And if some professors lose their positions for what they write or say, the effect on many other professors will be such that their usefulness to their students and to society will be gravely reduced. In brief, freedom of speech has a very special function in the case of those whose job it is to speak.⁶

Up to this point, I have been trying to state the classic case for tenure, as agreed upon over time by colleges and universities; by trustees, administrators, and faculty; and as sanctioned by society. Now I would like to turn to the second half of my assignment: to see if there is a distinctively "faculty" point of view regarding tenure. If, as many people seem to feel, tenure is primarily for the faculty's benefit, intended to give faculty members not only freedom but economic security and perhaps the right to slow down and take it easy, then the faculty (as chief beneficiary) should have a special point of view about the matter. One might expect the faculty, in its own self-interest, to be an uncritical supporter of tenure. In point of fact, the faculty is often far from uncritical of tenure. Indeed, looking at tenure purely in terms of their own economic self-interest, many faculty members believe that they pay a high price for a tenure that they may not need nor want.

The most penetrating analysis of tenure from the vantage point of faculty self-interest has been made by Machlup, a truly distinguished economist. Machlup acknowledges at the outset that not all faculty members may weigh the personal advantages or disadvantages of tenure alike. He observes:

Different types of academic persons will be impressed with different

³ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁴ Fritz Machlup, "On Some Misconceptions Concerning Academic Freedom," *Ibid.*, pp. 177-209.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

⁶ *Ibid.*

advantages and disadvantages; the balance of advantages, therefore, will depend on the composition of the academic population. One may expect that the security of income which tenure affords will be appreciated less by younger men without dependents than by men in their forties, or older, with families; less by the enterprising and courageous than by the spiritless and timid; less by the self-confident than by the self-conscious; less by the professors in safe and noncontroversial subjects than by those in politically sensitive subjects; less by those satisfied with the status quo than by those who want to challenge tradition. Thus, in order to estimate the relative numbers of those who may personally and individually benefit from strict rules of academic tenure, one would have to estimate the sizes of the various categories enumerated. This I cannot undertake except for one of the divisions, where the distribution is obvious without any empirical check. I refer to the fact that the teacher-scholars in safe subjects are an overwhelming majority and those in politically sensitive fields a small minority.⁷

Conceding as he does that some faculty members may well want tenure while others may not want it or feel they need it, Machlup does reach one overall conclusion regarding faculty self-interest and tenure. That conclusion is that tenure probably has a depressing effect upon faculty salaries. He has argued this point upon two occasions:

Academic freedom cannot be secured without academic tenure. Tenure, or job security, tends to reduce mobility; and reduced mobility, in the long run, tends to depress the salary levels of the group concerned (particularly because movement to alternative occupations is discouraged). Whereas low salary levels obtain for almost all professors, it is only a small fraction of all teachers and scholars that are at all likely ever to disseminate ideas critical of the opinions held by the professional, political, or ecclesiastical authorities, and are thus in any danger of incurring serious disapprobation, and therefore in need of the protection accorded by the rules of academic freedom and tenure.⁸

At another time, Machlup added this economic analysis:

What is really relevant is that the supply of teachers is increased if job security is added to pecuniary rewards offered. Even with a given demand, an increase in supply will tend to reduce the money salary on the average. The assumption that the offer of job security increases the supply of teachers is sometimes rejected on the ground that many, perhaps even most, people do not really care for tenure, and therefore would enter the academic profession regardless of tenure. This fact is beyond dispute, but of no relevance to the point. Even if the overwhelming majority of the potential supply of academic teachers did not give two hoots about tenure, it is the "margin" that counts in the determination of price. In other words, if only ten per cent of all teachers were attracted by the combination of salary and security, it would be this ten per cent that counts. Withdraw the security provision from the package, and these people withdraw from the academic market to other occupations, where they find higher pecuniary rewards, higher fringe benefits, more security, more prestige, or more fun.⁹

Yet, Machlup concludes, and I agree, there is still an overwhelmingly important reason why

⁷ Fritz Machlup, "In Defense of Academic Tenure," *Ibid.*, p. 320. The entire statement, which was the 1964 Presidential Address at the 50th Annual Meeting of the AAUP, is found *Ibid.*, pp. 306-338.

⁸ Machlup, "On Some Misconceptions Concerning Academic Freedom," *Ibid.*, p. 181.

⁹ Machlup, "In Defense of Academic Tenure," *Ibid.*, p. 324.

academic tenure must be retained, even though it may have some disadvantages for the faculty and perhaps for the institution. This reason is, of course, the absolute social necessity in a free, dynamic society for the maintenance of a free and continuing flow of data, ideas, discoveries, and educated men and women into the society from the college or university. In the words of Machlup:

The fact that perhaps only three or four of every thousand professors would ever have occasion to say or write things that would bring them into conflict with the authorities, or with power groups in society, explains why it is sometimes difficult to rally all faculty members to the vigorous support of academic freedom. There are always a good many professors in "safe" subjects or with "safe" ideas who resent the activities of the "trouble makers" on the faculty. We can understand if they refuse to regard themselves as "beneficiaries" of the "privilege" of academic freedom. For, it is in the interest of society at large, not just in the interest of the professors, that academic freedom is defended.

Society as a whole has much to gain from academic freedom. Since academic freedom promotes intellectual innovation and, indirectly, material as well as intellectual progress, to safeguard it is in the social interest. It is important that the few potential trouble makers are encouraged to voice their dissent, because on such dissent, however unpopular, the advancement of our knowledge and the development of material, social, or spiritual improvements may depend. Materially, professors as a group gain from their freedom only as members of society, and at best in proportion to the gain accruing to society.

Ultimately, then, academic freedom is a right of the people, not a privilege of a few; and this situation is not affected by the fact that most people know little about it. It is the people at large who have a right to learn what scholars may succeed in finding out if they are left free and secure from reprobation. It is the people at large who have a right to the cultural and material benefits that may flow from the teaching and the inquiries of scholars who have nothing to fear when they make honest mistakes.¹⁰

Thus, I would restate the general topic for this session. The topic now asks, "What is the Institution's Responsibility to the Faculty?" As far as academic tenure is concerned, the real question is, "What is the responsibility of the faculty and the institution to society?" The answer to that question is: to remain free. The preservation of an effective tenure system is one of the necessary means to that end.

¹⁰ Machlup, "On some Misconceptions Concerning Academic Freedom," *Ibid.*, pp. 181-182.

THE TENURE SYSTEM AS VIEWED BY AN ADMINISTRATOR

David Mathews, President
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa

All too often the idea of tenure is synonymous with academic laziness; the picture emerges of the aspiring professor who, having finally been granted tenure, buries his earlier dedication and begins to look into fishing equipment. When it is then argued, and often is, that the greatest freedom appear to the general public as the "sacred cows" of fuzzy-headed intellectuals whose sole purpose is to feed their masters. Those of us in academe often present tenure in the same way a master teacher presents an equation in algebra; as an axiom to be rigidly accepted as a self-evident truth to be revered.

There is a good deal of axiomatic reasoning and inflated prose floating around in support of tenure, but today I want to explore the question of tenure pragmatically, and from a very utilitarian point of view. Is tenure a boon for one class of citizens (college faculty) or does it serve some useful purpose for society as a whole? Although I cannot show you that tenure will solve the problems of the cities or stop inflation, I am willing to try to defend tenure in public and common sense terms because of its benefits to society, through the instrumentality of better universities. In summary, tenure, properly used (and I will comment on that later), is a device for enabling a university to better meet its responsibilities for education and service to the public that it serves.

First of all, tenure tends to create stability in an institution. In at least one sense, faculty mobility—and indeed administrative mobility—is greatly detrimental to essential continuity of programs in any one institution and to the very identity of an institution. The analogy of an institution to an athletic team is not an uncommon one. A dean and his faculty form a closely-knit educational team; however, members of this team, unlike those on a football team, cannot function efficiently when substitutes are regularly sent in to replace members who started out playing the "game," working toward a unique educational end. It is a unique educational end. It is unique because members of this team are not drilled to perform in a certain number of pre-set "plays" but actually create and recreate the rules of the "game" as they go along, the rules and strategies of the game being a reflection of each one's own personality and training.

I do not know what statistics, if any, might be marshalled to support the positive value of institutional stability. However, one has only to look at the leading universities in the country to see that their particular identify stems, in part, from the president, but in an equal or greater part from individual faculty members or departmental faculties who have been long associated with a particular university and who have given shape to its departments and overall academic programs.

Although we do not know all the effects of tenure, we do know that it tends to curtail the mobility of faculty to the definite advantage of the institution which has granted tenure. And we know that the professorial group has become a very mobile group indeed. We know that tenure is one factor a prospective faculty members considers when joining an institution; and in the present competition for good faculty members, an institution without an acceptable tenure policy, at least in general compliance with AAUP guidelines, would be placed at an intolerable disadvantage in faculty recruiting. Certainly, colleges which already face enough recruitment obstacles would be wary to add another.

Job security, another result of tenure, is in our day being considered more and more a fundamental right for all American citizens. It has been in the past a little recognized fact "that 'tenure' is a widely accepted aspect of employment in many areas other than the academic one. It often passes unchallenged, and even unrecognized, in such diverse occupational fields as business, the law, religion, and the civil service."¹ If present tenure practices are abolished, we might be forced into a management-labor relationship which, in an educational institution, might not be conducive to the close cooperation essential to properly integrated faculty-administration control of the institution or to creative academic planning. Unlike business and industry, the educational institution depends upon its

¹ Clarke Byse and Louis Joughin, *Tenure in American Higher Education*, (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1959), vii.

very rough equivalent to the "labor sector," that is, its faculty, for more than mere production. From the faculty must come many of the generative ideas that contribute to educational progress and even perhaps a certain amount of desirable obstructionism.

And this brings me down to the heart of the problem. Do the existing tenure regulations assure job security on the one hand and yet, on the other, necessitate the acceptance of mediocrity, or worse, incompetence?

Let me note in passing that while some may view the administrator's having unlimited power to dismiss faculty members who seem to obstruct an institution's educational goals as a tidy arrangement, I can think of nothing that would have a more deleterious effect on the future of American education. This situation, rather than working to prevent the collapse of American education, would only help hasten the accomplishment of this goal, if for no other reason than the "radicalizing" effect it would have on a large number of faculty members who at present, while perhaps not entirely satisfied with certain aspects of existing university structures, are still among the staunchest defenders of the overall philosophy of education that has contributed to the formation of the American university.

The question of the relationship between mediocrity and tenure, however, is really a question of whether the administrator can affect behavior and productivity through the tenure system. Actually, the tenure system offers two opportunities for the administration to judge the effectiveness and productivity of the faculty; at the time tenure is granted and at any time a faculty member may show incompetence or neglect of duty. The tenure system need not be a "locked-box" system. The trial period before tenure offers, or should offer, the administration ample evidence of the faculty member's worth. It is as important to the institution as to the individual, that a competent person be added to the ranks of the tenured faculty. The tenure system offers, if you will, a "safety recruitment device." The process of finding good faculty members does not end with the initial hiring; after a certain period during which the university observes the individual, six years according to the AAUP guidelines, three in most cases at our institution, the university reaffirms its commitment to the individual and on the basis of his observed skill in teaching and research asks him to remain with the institution permanently. For the administrators, this is a method of amassing (if they so wish) a permanent core of proficient teachers, so that each year does not bring a continual experiment with fledgling teachers.

All too often, those who glorify the controversy, those who emphasize the sides one must be on, imply that the university administrator is the reluctant partner who grants tenure only in the final show-down and only then because it is "high-noon" and he has run out of ammunition. But it is most obviously to the advantage of the university to retain the excellent teacher and scholar; why should the university not guarantee his employment during a term of great production? And the university which is not conscientious in its tenure policy, which grants tenure willy-nilly as a reward for serving three to seven years in the university, is defeating the purpose of the tenure system. Too often it is forgotten that tenure is a two-way bargain; only the proven good scholar is asked to honor the university with his presence. And if the good teacher takes undue advantage of the offer by allowing his skills and abilities to waste, if he neglects his duty, through due process he can be asked to leave. The university which is not blase about the quality of its teaching is one in which the quality of teaching must be better—not because the faculty member, tenured or not, fears for his job, but because both faculty and administration are honestly concerned about the job the university is doing. The atmosphere will be one of dedication and not boredom.

If tenure leads to inflexibility in curriculum and teaching methods and boredom in classrooms, the fault lies with the administration which allowed the distortion of tenure, not with the system itself. Administrations which have allowed mores or habits or fixed curricula because of the tenure system have lost the battle. And the universities have lost the war.

THE TENURE SYSTEM AS VIEWED BY A LEGISLATOR

**The Honorable Robert Graham
State Representative, Florida**

The university faculty finds itself under attack on three flanks. From outside the walls, the public has increasingly identified radical student action with permissive or encouraging professors. Congresswoman Edith Green, sponsor of proposed federal legislation to require development of campus codes of conduct as a prerequisite for federal funds, stated that her committee's investigations indicated faculty involvement has been a significant factor in virtually all instances of student disruption.

From within the university, the faculty is increasingly being seen by the students as their real enemy. In distinction from the small group of nihilist students, bent upon the destruction of the university and any other symbols of the society they reject, a large and responsible number of students are expressing concern over the quality of the academic experience which the modern college and university afford. In February of this year, the Higher Education Appropriation Committees of the Florida legislature conducted their biennial tour of university campuses. For the first time, this tour included a visit with representative students at each campus. Striking was the similarity of the students' concern with the undergraduate instruction program. To date, these concerned students have seen the administration as the barrier to relief from their complaints. The faculty has been viewed as their acquiescing ally. This state of neutrality is on the verge of breach, as the students realize that the true source of power lies not in the administration building but in the classroom and the faculty office.

The third attack on the security of the faculty lies in its own progeny. Since World War II, with the doubling and tripling of college students, faculty members have been in short supply and thus great demand. Scarcity provided their surest protection. During this period, approximately half of the Ph.D. graduates from American universities have entered academic life, with the balance opting for government or private business. The demand for Ph.D.s has resulted in a great increase in our universities' capacity to educate at the graduate level. At the current and projected level of production, and with a reduction in the growth rate of enrollment, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, chaired by Clark Kerr, estimates that by 1980 only 20 percent of the Ph.D. graduates will be able to find positions in higher education, and there is no indication that the needs of government and business for employees with Ph.D.s will increase sufficiently to fill the gap. Thus, the security of doctoral economics is rapidly eroding.

In each of these attacks, the concept of tenure is brought under question: by the public, as a shield for the radical professor; by the student, as a protection for instructional incompetency and senility; and even by some members of the faculty as an unwarranted economic protectionist device.

The legislator cannot avoid being affected by each of these voices, for it is his unique role in our society to reflect, synthesize, and, on occasion, attempt to shape and lead public opinion.

The quality of leadership is urgently called for now. The Southern Regional Education Board and many of us individually have stated our strong objection to campus violence and disruption and support of university administrations in their efforts to maintain an atmosphere of reason and calm. We have an equal obligation to the faculty to interpret to the public the necessity of legitimate dissent on a university campus—even when we may disagree with the dissenter.

In examining the appropriate legislative response to tenure, a basic legislative style must be forged within the political process. Tenure is, in the final analysis, only one of a broad range of factors which affect the environment within which higher education takes place. Several other such factors—faculty organization, institutional decision-making—have been discussed at this conference. While legislatures have the responsibility for establishing the basic framework for all state government, the specific components and mix of the environment should be left to the administrative officials charged with conducting that function.

The avoidance of administrative minutia is not a removal or a downgrading of the legislator from his appropriate and non-delegable policy-making function. Rather, it is a re-focusing by the legislator on his most critical function: overseeing the establishment and degree of attainment of objectives by

governmental agencies.

To put this specifically in the context of legislative evaluation of tenure—I do not believe that the legislature should involve itself in mandating, prescribing, or modifying a university's tenure system. To me, the relevant legislative issue is not whether a university has tenure, but whether the university attains its objectives of quality instruction, research and service, with or without tenure.

The traditional wisdom of the academic community has been that tenure is a significant element in the achievement of these objectives. I am willing to accept this assumption if the academic community is willing to accept two corollaries.

The first is that the objectives of the college or university will be established in such a manner that they can be evaluated by the political arm of government through the application of meaningful criteria. I am sensitive to the difficulties of evaluating intangible objectives, but I also believe that too much homage has been paid to the tyranny of obtuseness, and that considerable sharpening is possible in evaluating academic activities. The first responsibility for establishing these objectives and procedures for evaluation lies with the administration and faculty; however, failure to perform leaves no alternative but for other agencies, including the legislature, to do so if the review function is to be fulfilled.

The second corollary to accepting the academic community's assessment of the importance of tenure is for the academic community to address itself to the alternatives which are foregone in adopting a tenure system. Two of these alternatives, which are lost in part or whole, are the free play of competitive pressures to improve individual performance, and a fuller professional mobility. Steps to mitigate the loss of competitive pressures would include: (1) a greater scrutiny of faculty members prior to the granting of tenure; (2) an increased emphasis on instructional competence as a criterion in the granting of tenure; and (3) a rigorous intra-professional review of those to whom tenure has been granted to insure that it does not become a security blanket for the middle-aged Linus.

Tenure's inhibition to full professional mobility might be solved by a discriminating application of it, in recognition that the academic community has a larger professional and societal obligation. For example, it has been suggested that tenure is inappropriate in colleges of education. There, high value should be attached to a continuous renewal of the profession through interchange among public school classroom and administration and the college of education. In this instance, the granting of tenure has retarded service by the educator in the multiple interrelated facets of his profession to the detriment of the individual, the public schools and society.

It is of great significance to both the campus and the statehouse that the tenure system be viewed in the perspective of an internal process whose relevance to legislators is as one of the several factors affecting the degree to which end objectives are accomplished. As all of state government reorients on an end-results basis, the university, with its exceptional capabilities for analysis and self-appraisal, should be in a competitively advantageous position among competing state functions.

If the legislature takes an end-result view, it can be freed from stultification by triviality—which has too often characterized it in the past—and gain the opportunity to assert leadership in its full policy role.

INFLUENCES OF THE NEW FACULTY

Lewis B. Mayhew, Professor of Education
Stanford University

Because of the kind of people they are and the nature of their work, college professors have always been a mystery and an enigma to those outside the university. They seemed frequently preoccupied with precious or trivial distinctions, demanded legal protection for their jobs not accorded other vocations and assumed the right to criticize even the most hallowed beliefs of the society. Their visible work day seemed comparatively short and they rejected the idea that what they did might be supervised—after all they considered themselves to be the university, not employed by it. However, such traits and behavior were generally tolerated because there was a generally understandable rationale for them. The search for truth requires refined instruments of analysis which to the outsider might appear trivial but which when applied, could frequently expose universal insights. And truth can be dangerous by threatening orthodoxy; hence if one is expected to inquire with objectivity some protection is necessary. While a lecture actually only consumes an hour, preparation for it is frequently a lifetime. And in theory a university is nothing more than a guild of scholars each seeking and speaking truth according to his own discipline.

But during the 1960's some professors have, for seemingly inexplicable reasons, begun to manifest behavior and to make demands which have puzzled, perplexed and troubled—not only outsiders—but administrators and board members within the university. It seemed almost as though a new breed of professor had evolved. Once disdainful of trade unionism, professors especially in junior and state colleges began to experiment with collective bargaining, application of economic sanctions and finally to strike and to refuse to cross picket lines of other strikers. San Francisco State and St. John's University are only the tip of the iceberg of faculty trade unionism. For over three centuries American professors had been content to allow deans and presidents to secure funds, build buildings, set salaries and handle the details of governing with only the stipulation that the faculty be allowed to pursue its own work without interruption. And that system produced the Harvards, Cornells, Chicagos and Stanfords of the nation. Suddenly professors began to demand not only a share in governance through academic senates but some insisted on veto power over every act of administration and theorized that presidents and deans were but chore boys for the faculty. One can speculate that some presidential uncertainties over student protest in the spring of 1969 resulted from unsureness as to how organized faculties would react.

In the realms of politics and public policy professors of the past had more frequently than not been content to remain isolated and remote, or to criticize in historical or theoretical terms. There was the widely held belief that the university, to be free from political interference, should itself refrain from political activity. But suddenly professors began to speak out on the most controversial political questions, to engage in direct political action and even to suggest that the universities they served should, as institutions, oppose the war in Viet Nam, oppose the draft and refuse to conduct defense-related research. And some went even further, joining with militant and protesting students to force changes in institutional or public policy through strikes, sit-ins and confrontation tactics. Some, particularly younger faculty, also began to adopt styles of dress and grooming similar to that of students—long hair, beards and sandals and psychedelic dress. In recent student protests it was frequently difficult to tell whether it was a now student or a now faculty member.

Through the use of such powers recently gained, as well as from the power generated through favorable market conditions, faculties have exerted some strong and unusual demands and made some interesting decisions. There has been consistent pressure for lighter and lighter teaching loads and greater time allowed for research, even when it was clear that perhaps a majority of faculty members were not interested or qualified for major research efforts. In the Viet Nam emotional climate, faculties have eliminated ROTC and urged administrations to reorganize investment policy so as not to support defense related industries—all judgments which likely would have been different had they been made in less turbulent times. And a few faculty members have almost created their own systems of ethics—as when a history faculty refused to assign any grades, rather than withhold grades from a few students who had been suspended for protest activity. Then, too, there is a growing uneasiness on the part of

activist faculty that the "system" would proscribe them for their political opinions, coupled with a willingness to generate student protest to support their beliefs. The winter upset at the University of Chicago stemmed from just this sort of thing.

Now the question arises, what is the long term significance of this phenomenon, and what impact will this new breed likely have on institutions, students, and ultimately on the total society? In the short term at least, it is obvious that some of this newer faculty behavior can be quite unsettling to those who until now have been responsible for the conduct of institutions, programs and development of American higher education. In a recent conference involving about 125 professors and administrators, a 12 year history of relatively tranquil and successful conduct of that conference was broken when a small group of faculty members, feeling an affinity for protesting or alienated young, and using some of their divisive tactics, tried to force the conference into new directions and to consider new, and possibly inappropriate concerns. This small group was able there, as groups can in any similar situation, to polarize two groups of adults, and allow to surface a variety of animosities and vindictive feelings, present in all human beings, but many of which were irrelevant to the central concerns of the conference.

But other things seem likely. First there is bound to be a steady increase in trade unionism including a variety of economic sanctions on the part of some college professors. Whether professors will join the Federation of Teachers or convert such organizations as the American Association of University Professors or the American Association for Higher Education into union-type activities is at this time moot. But the fact that a half-dozen states have passed legislation authorizing collective bargaining for college teachers, and the fact that strikes and threats of strikes have focused public attention on problems of professors is the sort of success which will spur further experimentation with union tactics and strategies. Further, these tactics will increasingly be directed, not toward the central administration of colleges or universities, but toward the legislature, boards of trustees or governors who unionists perceive correctly as being the ultimate source of power.

For the next few years one can expect a continuation of the alliance between some faculty members and militant youth, since both younger faculty members and college-age youth are affected by the same feelings of alienation and vague yearnings for a less complicated world. But, this alliance is transitory, for fundamentally, the faculty is the real enemy of students. Faculty members are the ones who have so preoccupied themselves with their own research, scholarship or consulting as to leave students feeling unloved and uncared-for, and younger faculty members who were trained in the graduate schools which value research above all else will quickly see that their professional and materialistic future will best be insured by concentrations on their own interests. Actually, it is central administration which seeks to provide the interesting, significant and "relevant" education which youth claims it wants.

In the past there were generally accepted patterns of behavior and ways of doing things which characterized college professors. The slow process of acculturation of the recent Ph.D. graduate into the ways of a single campus taught young professors how to relate to deans, presidents and students and how to bring about changes through the slow processes of academic administration. But higher education is expanding so rapidly and professors have become so mobile that this acculturative process has broken down. The fact that some traditional amenities have been lost will of course bother some. But the new breed of college faculty has just not been taught that colleges are older than they, and change slowly, that faculty teas and dinners, while frequently dull, do serve as an important stabilizing force for college communities; or that hierarchy is an essential if the wisdom of age can be combined with the enthusiasm of youth in some creative manner. Eventually, of course, some new standards of conduct and criteria for behavior will be evolved. But for at least another decade, life in an academic community will appear quite disordered.

Because of experiences since World War II, including considerable hyperbole on the part of both college presidents and faculty, and political leaders, as to the research power of the modern university, faculty members will expect increasing support for their research and a decrease in teaching duties. And since many will not receive the support they desire, they will feel frustrated, cheated and bitter. It is just possible that some recent criticism of defense based research which students and some faculty have expressed is at least in part the result of a lowering of research support throughout the nation which left

the research-trained young Ph.D. without the grants he was led to expect and the necessity to stoop to teach. Over the long term, research will be even more important than it has in the past and faculty members will realize that some will and some will not be expected to do significant research. But, for the moment, excessive demands and excessive petulance must be expected.

Of recent years, faculty have demanded, and gained, an increased voice in collegiate governance. Through senates, academic councils, faculty associations, and the like, faculty have not only consolidated responsibility for the curriculum, conditions of student entrance and exit, and membership on the faculty, but some influence on selection of administration and even budget allocation. Demands for further power are not likely to abate for at least several more years and it can be expected that faculties will eventually gain more power than they can use wisely. When that happens the pendulum will begin a counter-swing, for if institutions are to function well, there must be a balance of power with the administration being clearly responsible for such things as finance, administrative appointment and veto over tenure appointments.

Since collegiate institutions will increasingly be in urban settings, facing the enormous problem of an urban society, requiring both scholarly and political solutions, it seems likely that professors will engage more and more in direct political action. This is, of course, dangerous for engagement in political action suggests at least that those who do so should be subject to the procedures of politics including political appointment. This of course is antithetical to the concepts of academic freedom and tenure of appointment to protect faculty who must deal with controversial ideas. But, despite the danger some, and it now appears an increasing number of faculty, wish to lead the university into a direct involvement in social action. In effect this means that the days of the ivory tower image of academe are over. Eventually some new styles will be developed which will balance detachment and objectivity with some direct involvement, just as happened when land grant colleges were growing. But until that new synthesis is found, there will be some tense days.

This hasty sketch of likely future professorial behavior would be incomplete without some suggestion as to how society, legislators, administrators, trustees, and colleagues might properly respond. First, no matter how vexing a unionized faculty threatening strike, faculty efforts to emasculate administrative powers, faculty public demonstrations for unpopular causes, or even faculty participation in direct protest activities might appear to those responsible for financing and maintaining higher education, punitive legislation or attempts to punish or apply other sanctions are not appropriate. They can lead only to an increased polarization which in both the short and long run is unhealthy. Further, many of the developments need to be accepted for they are part of the change sweeping society. Greater faculty involvement in governance is a certainty and is really a healthy development. There is, of course, presently an incipient social backlash against protesting students, and as faculty members for the moment ally themselves with students, there will be strong temptation to proscribe them and protest their behavior. But to yield to that allure would be a serious mistake. Tolerance of others in times of rapid change and heightened tensions is essential if new institutions and life styles are to be created—and they must be.

Relatedly there should be no attempt to limit academic freedom, no matter how unpopular or controversial a subject is which professors choose to explore. The American university has grown great in direct proportion to the academic freedom exercised by its professors and this must be preserved at all cost. It may be embarrassing to a president for a younger professor to publish a letter advocating premarital sex, or for a senior professor to be placed in jail for participating in a protest march against the war in Viet Nam, but this embarrassment should not be converted into punitiveness.

But there are positive things to be done. In the past, university administration has been quite secretive about such matters as budgets and long range plans for program development. This has resulted in a climate of suspiciousness which probably made more intense demands for faculty power when they were finally expressed. Now some matters must be kept secret for a time—but generally the facts about admissions, finances, building plans and building hopes could well be shared with the full university community—faculty, students and the several publics to which institutions respond. Here legislators have a specific responsibility to accept increased candor in good faith, and not penalize an institution for revealing in public that its enrollment projections were off. If administration would make information, both good news and bad, more generally available, tensions would gradually recede. There

are enough good examples to evidence that this does happen.

Because institutions are more complex and will become even more complicated, there is need for more constitutions, by-laws, written rules of procedure and the like. Many of the specific episodes which have jeopardized good faculty-administrator relations, such as those which became cases for the AAUP, have happened because procedures and processes were not written in sufficient detail to guide action. In the past, of course, institutions could and did function quite effectively with a minimum of documentation. With large scale organizations written policies and procedures are essential to facilitate smooth human relations. It is somewhat apt to recall that formal etiquette derived largely from the French court in the seventeenth century and was developed to make the close living at the court tolerable. Wise administration, therefore, should insure that a constitution governs the division of power, that by-laws indicate how such critical matters as curricular decision or appointment and promotion are handled and that all are specifically conscious of what rights and prerogatives they have. This implies that there will be specific grants of power from boards of trustees to administration and faculties so that resultant organizations will have real significance.

In part faculty expectations have been created through faulty or non-existent long range planning for an entire system. Thus without plans individual institutions may aspire to changing character and convey to faculty the promise of ultimate graduate programs and research opportunities, when the state will really not support such developments. Or a faulty plan may designate that some institutions will become comprehensive universities, thus creating expectations which are beyond the resources of the state. In either case faculty become disappointed and search for scapegoats—a not difficult task on most university campuses. This matter of expectations deserves still further comment for in most examples of low faculty morale, probing reveals either that exact expectations were not communicated to faculty members, or imprecise ones were, or expectations of faculty at the time of appointment had changed by the time decisions on promotion and tenure were to be made. A former state college turned university in the 1960's contains a good fifty percent of the faculty who were led to believe that teaching was important, only to find after transition that the rules had been changed and that research has become the main route to advancement.

Faculty members, just as do students, experience loneliness in large complicated institutions. When institutions were smaller and faculty cadres more stable, newcomers were at once accepted by various small groups, ranging from a college-owned apartment house, a small department or a college-dominated neighborhood in the community. The situation now, however, is radically different in the larger institutions, located for the most part in urban areas. Faculty homes will be scattered throughout the city. Departments are larger than average faculties of a few decades earlier, and the persistent mobility insures that no lasting primary groups or even friendship groups are possible. This loneliness, of course, contributes to frustration and anger which is too frequently reflected in on-campus aberrant behavior. Somehow or other, for both faculty and students, more significant small groups must be contrived. What is needed on a broad scale is something of the force of a cluster college or an overseas campus for everyone.

EMERGING AND PROSPECTIVE NEW RELATIONSHIPS IN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

William B. Aycock, Kenan Professor of Law
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

My assignment is to discuss emerging and prospective new relationships in the academic community. The focus of my discussion will be on public institutions of higher learning; however, some of the things I have to say are relevant to private institutions. My assignment would have been easier if I could have found a typical academic community. There is not one and I hope this will always be so. But all such communities do have some things in common—they are subject to acts of obstruction, disruption and destruction. Furthermore, they are subject to demands, which if granted, surely would lead to deterioration. Most people are uneasy about prospects for peace on the campus. Turbulence on many campuses has puzzled, bewildered and sometimes angered governors, legislators and the public in general.

Since World War II, the public through its legislative representatives has expressed faith in higher education in concrete terms. Funds have been appropriated in increasing amounts to insure that more young people might grow and develop in an academic community. Notwithstanding, the current upheavals, for the most part, have been instigated from within the academic community, and in most instances, the institution has demonstrated that it is woefully unprepared to deal with internal threats to its own freedom. A question often posed is—why are these communities unprepared to cope with attacks which threaten their existence? Obviously there is no simple answer for such a complex question. However, an understanding of the relationship between the components of the academic community will supply some helpful clues. At the same time, it will become apparent that new relationships must be fashioned before academic communities can both defend themselves and effectuate essential reforms.

An institution of higher learning is a corporate body, but only in superficial ways is it like a business corporation, or, for that matter, a typical government agency. An academic community is unique in both what it does and in the ways it goes about its work. Faculty, students and administrators are in a variety of ways engaged in discovering, collecting, conserving, recording, disseminating and absorbing knowledge. Faculty members, of course, are employees. But they are not like the main body of employees in a business corporation or in most government agencies.

Each member of the faculty has acquired considerable expertise in at least one field of knowledge, and many have had experience in the academic community equal to or superior to that of many presidents and members of the governing boards. To analogize—if the president of the institution is a five-star general, so most members of the faculty would consider themselves also. Each professor has his own separate command in his classroom, in his research, and in his writing and publication. Even the few who choose to rely on yellowed dog-eared notes feel free to do so. Further, in most institutions, including the most distinguished ones, the faculty, for all practical purposes, selects new colleagues, passes on promotions, and determines whether or not one of their number should be disciplined or discharged for unfitness, incompetence, or neglect of duty. Occasional instances of summary dismissal, or attempts to discharge a faculty member by the president and governing board have meant trouble with the rest of the faculty from within, and from faulty organizations from without. Academic policies, including admission standards for students, are not formulated by the president and the governing board, but are initiated by the faculty.

But what about the relationship of the faculty to the students in the area of student conduct? To illustrate the changing relationships which have occurred in this area permit me briefly to refer to one academic community. In my own institution there was a time when the Board of Governors (trustees) exercised direct control over student conduct.

During that time a member of the faculty incited the students to rebel against established authority. The students responded by taking action against the faculty. History recorded that they actually:

beat Mr. Gillaspie personally, waylaid and stoned Mr. Webb, accosted Mr. Flinn with the intention of beating him, but were diverted from it, and at length uttered violent threats against Mr. Murphey and Mr. Caldwell, which were never put into execution.

This insurrection was partially attributed to the fact that the faculty did not have sufficient authority to discipline students. Incidentally this incident occurred in 1799. Subsequently, the governing board delegated authority to the faculty and president to discipline students, and, finally, a further delegation was made to organized student government. I believe it is accurate to assert that the trend on most campuses has been for the faculty to get out of the distasteful business of disciplining students. Occasionally, a faculty member may, as a personal matter, penalize a student on his grade for cheating. Apart from this, faculty members have shied away from the role of "in loco parentis," especially since World War II when older students, many of them veterans and also married, arrived on campus. The point which needs to be emphasized is that most faculties had ceased dealing with student misconduct during times of campus peace, and as a result, understandably, most faculties have been virtually helpless in combatting student tactics which threaten the very existence of the academic community.

Students, through their instrumentality of student government, have also proved inept in facing up to the current crisis. Over a period of years, either through formal or informal agreements with the faculty or president or both, students have assumed responsibility for handling certain types of student misconduct. In dealing with such offenses as cheating, stealing from one another, and lying to student officials, I believe it is fair to say that student government has been as effective—perhaps more so—than their elders could have been. On the other hand, student officials have been more and more reluctant to do much about misuse of alcohol and drugs, or immorality. In these areas the doctrine of *laissez faire* prevails, especially when the offense has occurred off campus. Currently, some student leaders, not necessarily militants, believe that a student who violates a criminal law is subject to punishment only by the civil authorities. Under their notion of the concept of double jeopardy the offending student is immune from any disciplinary action by student government, faculty or administration. Regardless of the reasons, it is evident that student governments have not held students accountable for acts of destruction and disruption on the campuses.

Most citizens, including public officials, assume that the president is in charge and many are mystified because he has not used the power and authority they assume he has to deal promptly with disciplinary problems on the campus.

It is a commonly held presumption that an institution of higher learning operates in the following manner: The governing board formulates the rules and regulations, and it selects a president who is the boss. The president hires the corporate workers, *i.e.*, the faculty. The president informs the faculty and the students of the rules and regulations promulgated by the governing board, and he is also authorized to issue executive orders. The students and faculty having received the "word" through channels are supposed to obey orders. If they disobey, the president is charged with the duty to take appropriate disciplinary action. Should the president fail to perform his duties, he should be replaced by the governing board. The foregoing might describe lines of authority in a business corporation or a military organization but it does not portray accurately the way an institution of higher learning usually operates. Even the militants proceed on the assumption that a president is in charge of the academic program as well as the business affairs of the institution. Their non-negotiable demands are usually presented to the president and not to the students, faculty or the governing board. One need not probe deeply into the complex "workings" of an academic community to discover that in many areas, including the academic program and the disciplining of students, the power of the president is more imagined than real. Few presidents, if any, would issue an executive order establishing a Black Studies Program, or altering admission requirements, or lowering academic standards without approval of the faculty.

When such demands are made on the president, he refers them to an appropriate faculty (students might be represented) committee for consideration and a recommendation, a process which takes time. The demandants find this procedure unacceptable and usually charge the president with deliberate delay. Acts of disruption may follow. What then? As previously indicated, students and

faculty may, in fact, have authority to deal with such acts, but, in general, neither has assumed responsibility. Thus when the academic community is caught in an emergency situation, the duty to make hard decisions is thrust upon the president. In most instances, he has arranged for hurried consultations with faculty and student groups before taking action. His efforts to speed up the academic machinery reveals that the academic gears do not mesh well at accelerated speeds. The academic community is geared only for peacetime operations and not for internal revolution. Instead of a unified effort to protect the community, there has resulted a splintering process involving faculty against faculty, student against student, and with elements of both critical of the president and other administrative officials. Governing boards also have been critical of the president and in doing so often have demonstrated a lack of awareness of the subtle relationships in the academic community which preclude a president from accomplishing much without the substantial support of the faculty and students.

President Louis T. Benezet of Claremont University Center sketched the following picture of the president's performance:

The president has been too lax; he has been too firm and unyielding; he has not listened to his faculty; he has indulged his faculty or his students; he has acted too fast; he has waited too long to act; he has called the police; he hasn't called in the police. Whatever it is he should have done, he didn't do it; whatever he shouldn't have done, he foolishly did.

The foregoing observations on faculty, students, and the president, although in capsule form, are adequate, I hope, to show that the contours of authority are difficult to draw and even though diffusion of authority may not seriously affect the efficiency of peacetime operations, changes must be made in order to cope successfully with threats of internal revolution. Thus let us consider new and emerging relationships.

The most critical element in the current situation is, of course, the insurgents who are determined to start a revolution on the campuses. To deal effectively with them it is essential that the academic community establish a close working relationship with the civil authorities. The academic community has a duty to save itself, and this may require protection by the police. It is folly for faculty, students or administrative officials to assume that they can satisfy the demands of militants who are determined to exploit every means to obtain their revolutionary goals. Admittedly, to establish a close working relationship with the police is not a happy choice for the academic community. Nevertheless, it may be essential for survival.

New relationships must be worked out within the academic community. This must be done from within the community and not from without. Legislation dictating the internal operations of the academic community is not the answer. Likewise, policies promulgated on the initiative of the governing board will not suffice. Further, governing boards should not succumb to the temptation to find a "tough" president who is not only eager but deems it a public service to take command. What then, should be done? New relationships should be established in order to create a more workable combination to deal with the problems at hand. The president is the appropriate person to take the initiative in this undertaking. Although a variety of options may be open, I will select one to illustrate what I have in mind.

It is essential to establish machinery in the academic community (as a few have done) to serve as a linch-pin of its components such as a campus-wide council composed of faculty, students and administrators to serve as a continuing policy making body. The student representatives would have a significant role in such an arrangement. If a few students are the source of our current despair, the many are a source of hope for the future. Already, it is not uncommon for students to be represented on committees to recommend a president. Students have been selected to serve on administrative committees, particularly when matters directly affecting student life such as housing, athletics, fraternities and sororities, and discipline are involved.

More recently standing committees, traditionally confined to faculty, have been opened to students. Currently, students are beginning to be added to governing boards. I would simply accelerate this process by providing substantial student representation on a college or university council. Without

going into detail, the faculty should be in the majority, the president should preside, and deans and other important administrative officials should serve ex officio. To splice together the components is a "tooling up" process. The next question is how should this council begin to deal with the major problems at hand? A good way to cement the components would be to formulate a charter of academic freedom. I emphasize that such a charter would apply to students, faculty, and administration. This charter ought to define academic freedom in understandable terms. As I will illustrate later, many acts that have occurred on some campuses are flagrant violations of the concept of academic freedom. Such acts should not be tolerated simply because they were performed by members of the academic community.

My own view of academic freedom is that it is not a special kind of freedom granted to faculty to soothe their alleged sensitive nature. As a faculty member, the only freedoms I need either on or off the campus are the same freedoms which are supposed to be available to all members of our society. I need exactly the same freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion and other freedoms guaranteed to all citizens.

I claim no immunity from the laws of libel or slander, or trespass, or against inciting riots or destruction of property. Thus academic freedom is neither a special freedom nor a special license for me to disobey laws which apply to all other persons. On the other hand, academic freedom means that there must not be special limitations on the freedom of the academic community such as speaker ban laws. Although there is nothing special in the freedoms and limitations in academic freedom, there is something special about the exercise of these freedoms which is of vital importance. A member of an academic community must not be subject to disciplinary action, including dismissal or discharge, for exercising his freedom to speak or publish the truth as he understands it. The very essence of an academic community is the right to exercise these freedoms unfettered. Compared to that afforded employees of a business corporation or to most political appointees this kind of protection is special. For instance, an individual working in the academic community should be free to criticize members of the governing board or public officials; whereas we know that an employee in a business corporation or a political appointee may jeopardize his employment by criticizing policies adopted by his superiors.

It can readily be seen that a charter of academic freedom could provide a measuring rod for testing the validity of proposals or acts which might affect the freedom of the academic community whether they originate from within or from without.

A few illustrations may be helpful. The academic community traditionally has insisted on an open forum, and attempts by legislators, or governing boards, or any outside authority to interfere have been vigorously opposed. Yet, in recent months, we know that students, and perhaps other members of the academic community, have heckled and otherwise interfered with the open forum on the campus. Academic freedom is transgressed by internal as well as external interference, and in either event it must be opposed by the academic community. Any demand stamped "non-negotiable" runs counter to the concept of academic freedom. Such demands must be subject to discussion and consideration on their merits preliminary to a decision to accept, alter, or reject them.

Amnesty for violations of the criminal laws is a special privilege not applicable to other citizens and to grant it to members of the academic community is inconsistent with a charter of academic freedom. For the underprivileged deliberately to violate the laws is not justifiable and cannot be long endured; for members of the academic community, who should know the consequences, to flout the laws of society is equally unjustifiable and such transgressions by them should not be endured at all. Obviously, one who willfully, by use of violence, force, coercion, threat, intimidation or fear obstructs, disrupts, or attempts to obstruct or disrupt the normal function of the academic community, or who advises, procures, or incites others to do so violates the charter of academic freedom and ought to be held accountable to the academic community as well as to the laws of society.

The council, then, is a suitable instrumentality through which all components of the academic community may agree on permissible and impermissible conduct in terms of the charter of academic freedom. Violations of the terms of the charter should be specified and provision should be made for enforcement of the rules. Enforcement is not a task simply for the administration, or the faculty or the students. A hearings committee composed of all components should be established and this committee

should have jurisdiction to deal with all violations which interfere with the freedom of the academic community. It should be emphasized that such a hearings committee should have adequate staff assistance, and its proceedings should be in accordance with the essential requirements of due process.

The council, having first addressed itself to dealing with conduct which threatens the existence of the academic community, should then turn to the subject of educational reform. Although many changes have taken place since World War II, valid questions have been raised recently on most campuses by students, faculty and administrators concerning many aspects of the educational program. These questions deserve full consideration. On some campuses much is already under study—usually by ad hoc committees appointed hurriedly in response to pressure. A council composed of representatives of all components of the academic community is a more suitable instrumentality because it could be charged with the continuous duty to study and make changes in the educational program.

At this point a word of caution is in order. The creation of a workable combination to preserve and improve the academic community does not imply any authority in the council to become the corporate voice and purport to speak for all on matters which must be resolved outside the academic community. On such matters as voting rights of eighteen-year-olds, the anti-ballistic missile system, or the Viet Nam War, the academic community speaks with many voices. Further, a corporate stand on political matters would be inconsistent with academic freedom and contrary to the basic purpose of the academic community, which is to provide a favorable environment for each individual to formulate his own opinions on such issues.

In summary, new relationships must emerge. The entire community must become involved in establishing a workable combination to insure the continuation of the institution, and, at the same time, to preserve within the community maximum opportunities for individual initiative. Thus a delicate balance must be achieved. This can be done only within the institution.

In looking to the future I am reminded of a statement made by a student in 1871, in my own institution. The university survived the Civil War but closed during Reconstruction. As it closed, this student chalked on the blackboard: "This old University has busted and gone to hell today." In that dark hour, this statement was, fortunately, only the reaction of a disillusioned youth.

Today, many academic communities are reeling from surprise attacks, but the sound of the trumpet is loud and clear. I am confident that residing in each institution are enough people—students, faculty, and administrators—with ability, courage, wisdom and determination who will unite in a common effort not only to repel threats from within but also to fashion an educational program responsive to the needs of a new generation.

ROSTERDELEGATESALABAMA

Representative Bert Bank
Tuscaloosa

Senator Mylan Engel
Mobile

Senator Fred Folsom
Cullman

ARKANSAS

Senator John F. Bearden, Jr.
Leachville

Representative B. Doug Brandon
Little Rock

Senator Jim Caldwell
Rogers

Representative Lacy H. Landers
Benton

Representative Ode Lee Maddox
Oden

Senator Knox Nelson
Pine Bluff

Senator Thomas A. Penn
Cave City

Representative Wallace E. Rainwater
Fort Smith

Bob Riley
Little Rock

Representative Bennie Ryburn, Jr.
Monticello

Representative Ray S. Smith, Jr.
Hot Springs

FLORIDA

Representative William R. Conway
Ormond Beach

Representative Robert Graham
Miami Lakes

Senator Beth J. Johnson
Cocoa Beach

GEORGIA

Representative George B. Brooks
Crawford

Representative Chappelle Matthews
Athens

Representative H. Walstein Parker
Sylvania

Senator Lamar R. Plunkett
Bowdon

KENTUCKY

Senator Fred Bishop
Manchester

Representative George H. Greer
Owensboro

Representative Brooks Hinkle
Paris

Senator Clyde W. Middleton
Fort Mitchell

Representative J. Quentin Wesley
Morganfield

MARYLAND

Delegate Edna P. Cook
Silver Springs

Senator Mary L. Nock
Salisbury

MISSISSIPPI

Representative Charles B. Allen, Jr.
Amory

Senator Ellis B. Bodron
Vicksburg

Representative George P. Cossar
Charleston

Representative Horace H. Harned, Jr.
Starkville

Senator B. G. Perry
Horn Lake

NORTH CAROLINA

Representative Ike Andrews
Raleigh

Senator Russell Kirby
Raleigh

Representative Clarence E. Leatherman
Lincolnton

Senator Hector MacLean
Lumberton

OKLAHOMA

Representative Barbour Cox
Chandler

Representative T. W. Bill Holaday
Oklahoma City

Representative William G. Jones
Wilburton

Representative Marvin McKee
Guymon

Representative Leland Wolf
Noble

SOUTH CAROLINA

Senator J. C. Bonner
Gaffney

Representative Harold D. Breazeale
Pickens

Representative Purvis W. Collins
Winnsboro

Senator John Drummond
Greenwood

Representative W. Brantley Harvey, Jr.
Beaufort

Senator Robert C. Lake, Jr.
Whitmire

TENNESSEE

Representative Thomas B. Avery
Memphis

Senator Lamar Baker
Chattanooga

Senator William R. Bruce
Memphis

Senator J. O. Patterson, Jr.
Memphis

TEXAS

Representative Frank Calhoun
Abilene

Representative Don W. Cavness
Austin

Representative Hilary Doran, Jr.
Del Rio

VIRGINIA

Senator Lloyd C. Bird
Richmond

Delegate Edward E. Lane
Richmond

Senator Paul W. Manns
Bowling Green

Delegate Samuel E. Pope
Drewryville

Delegate J. Lewis Rawls, Jr.
Suffolk

Delegate D. French Slaughter, Jr.
Culpeper

Delegate J. Warren White, Jr.
Norfolk

WEST VIRGINIA

Senator Walter A. Holden
Clarksburg

Delegate Charles E. Lohr
Princeton

Delegate Charles R. Shaffer
Buckhannon

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

J. S. Anzalone
SREB Staff

Phil Ashler, Vice Chancellor for Administration
State University System of Florida

William B. Aycock, Kenan Professor of Law
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

M. Olin Cook, Executive Director
Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance, Arkansas

Archie Dykes, Chancellor
University of Tennessee, Martin

Emmett B. Fields,
Vice President and Dean of Faculties
University of Houston

C. V. Galbreath, Director of Higher Education
U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Dallas

Ted C. Gilbert, Executive Director
Kentucky Council on Public Higher Education

Edwin C. Godbold
SREB Staff

Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Governor
Commonwealth of Virginia

Winfred L. Godwin
SREB Director

Marcus Halbrook, Director
Legislative Council, Arkansas

C. Addison Hickman,
Vandever Professor of Economics
Southern Illinois University

W. Hugh McEniry, Vice Chancellor
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Wilbert McKeachie, Chairman,
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan

Harold L. McPheeters
SREB Staff

Peter B. Mann
SREB Staff

Henry Mason, Chairman,
Department of Political Science
Tulane University

David Mathews, President
University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa

Lewis B. Mayhew, Professor of Education
Stanford University

Jack L. Miller, Commissioner
Department of Finance and Administration,
West Virginia

David W. Mullins, President
University of Arkansas

Mary Ann Nama
SREB Staff

John S. Niblock
SREB Staff

William R. O'Connell
SREB Staff

Wanda Peterson
SREB Staff

William Plucknett, Faculty Council
University of Kentucky

E. F. Schietinger
SREB Staff

Ruth N. Smith
SREB Staff

Silas Snow, President
State College of Arkansas, Conway

Arthur Southerland, Instructor of Music
El Centro College

Herman E. Spivey, Professor of English
University of Florida

Joyce C. Tallman
SREB Staff

Carl Whillock, Assistant to the President
University of Arkansas

Prince B. Woodard, Director
Virginia State Council for Higher Education

Robert R. Wright, Professor of Law
University of Arkansas